UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XXII July, 1942 No. 1

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS TO SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, CHURCHES, AND ADULT STUDY GROUPS

BUREAU OF VISUAL INSTRUCTION

SUPPLEMENT 1942

Library of 16 mm. Educational Films, Lantern Slides, and Classroom Recordings

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS
CHAPEL HILL MCMXLII

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

http://www.archive.org/details/universityofnc2219421943

IMPORTANT MESSAGE TO OUR USERS

Due to the rationing program, it is necessary to discontinue the truck service. However, the rental fees of the Truck Delivery Plans as listed in last year's catalog will stand as such, with this one change: all users of Plan C through Plan Q will be required to deposit in advance with this Bureau ten (10) cents for each unit under the plan selected plus the stated rental fee. Out of this ten cents per unit charge, the Bureau will pay transportation by parcel post or express to the user, but the user must pay the return cost. For example: if Plan C is selected, it would be necessary to deposit with this Bureau $10 plus $50 or a total of $60. If Plan Q is selected, it would be necessary to deposit $20 for 200 units, plus $400, making a total of $420 for four weeks' use of 200 units of audio-visual aids.

In cooperation with the Government in its War Program, the Bureau of Visual Instruction has available a number of films dealing with the war. The rental is fifty cents on the first subject and twenty-five cents on each additional subject requested at the same time. The user is urged to take advantage of these timely film subjects and to keep informed regarding releases to be made during the year.

In addition to the University Extension Bulletin, July 1941, Vol. XXI and the Supplement for 1942, every user should possess a complete set of The H. W. Wilson Company's Educational Film Catalogs, which the Bureau offers at a greatly reduced price.

16mm. EDUCATIONAL FILM SUPPLEMENT

Wilson Catalog No.	*Title*	*Reels*	*Silent or Sound*	*Producer*	*Unit Value*
921	Abraham Lincoln	2	Silent	Eastman	4
623.38	Air Raid Warden	1	Sound	Photo & Sound	3
918	Americans All	2	Sound	CIAA	1
355	America's Call to Arms	1	Sound	Castle	3
342.73	American Way	1	Sound	American Film	3
917.12	Banff-Jasper Highway	1	Sound	Canada	1
940.53	Battle for France	1	Sound	Castle	3
630.93	Battle is in Our Hands	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
664.1	Beet and Cane Sugar	1	Silent	Eastman	2
914.3	Berlin	1	Silent	Eastman	2
637.3	Bip Goes to Town	1	Silent	U. S. Agric.	1
637.3	Bip Goes to Town	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
595.73	Block That Termite	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
612.1	Blood, The	1	Silent	Eastman	2
629.13	Bomber	1	Sound	OEM	1
918.1	Brazil	1	Sound	CIAA	1
070	Brazil Gets the News	1	Sound	CIAA	1
612.2	Breathing	1	Silent	Eastman	2
918	Buenos Aires	1	Sound	MMA	1
617.6	Care of the Teeth	1	Silent	Eastman	2
649	Child Care—Bathing the Infant	1	Silent	Eastman	2
649	Child Care—Feeding the Infant	1	Silent	Eastman	2
915.1	Children of China	1	Sound	Erpi	3
612.1	Circulation	1	Silent	Eastman	2
918	Colombia	1	Sound	CIAA	1
	Colonial Expansion	1	Sound	Erpi	3
621.38	Communication	1	Sound	Erpi	3
793.3	Dances of the Nations	1	Sound	Gutlohn	3
917.2	Day is New	1	Sound		1
973.9	Democracy in Action	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
616.2	Diphtheria	1	Silent	Eastman	2
	Early American Exploration	1	Sound	Erpi	3
617.7	Eyes, The	1	Sound	Erpi	3
617.7	Eyes, Advanced	1	Silent	Eastman	2
630.97	Farmers and Defense	2	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
630.93	Farm Front	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
616.7	Feet, The	1	Silent	Eastman	2
917.2	Fiesta of the Hills	1	Sound	MMA	1
614.84	Fight That Fire	1	Sound	Transfilm	3
614.8	Fighting the Fire Bomb	1	Sound	Transfilm	3
614.8	First Aid—Wounds and Fractures	1	Sound	Erpi	3
613.2	Food and Growth	1	Silent	Eastman	2
613.2	Food Series—Vitamin B	1	Silent	Eastman	2
613.2	Food Series—Vitamin D	1	Silent	Eastman	2
634.9	Forest Ranger	3	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
684	Forest Treasure	2	Sound	Veneer	1

Wilson Catalog No.	Title	Reels	Silent or Sound	Producer	Unit Value
649	For Health and Happiness	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
921	George Washington	4	Silent	Eastman	8
917.4	Harvests for Tomorrow	3	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
919.69	Hawaiian Islands	1	Silent	Eastman	2
333	Heritage We Guard	3	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
	High Spots	2	Sound	CIAA	1
629.21	Highway Mania	2	Sound	Gutlohn	6
917.28	Hill Towns of Guatamala	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
610.7	Home Nursing—Bed Bath	1	Silent	Eastman	1
610.7	Home Nursing—Routine Procedures	1	Silent	Eastman	2
610.7	Home Nursing—Special Procedures	1	Silent	Eastman	2
728	Home Place	3	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
598.2	How Birds Feed Their Young	1	Silent	Eastman	2
915.2	Japan	2	Silent	Eastman	4
940.53	Japs Bomb U. S. A.	1	Sound	Castle	1
663	Jerry Pulls the Strings	3	Sound	American Can	1
352	John Doe, Citizen	1	Silent	Bailey	2
976.9	Kentucky Pioneer	1	Sound	Erpi	3
630.97	Land	4	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
675	Leatherwork	1	Sound	Garrison	3
632.7	Life History of Yellow Fever Mosquito	1	Silent	Eastman	2
560	Lost World	1	Silent	Eastman	2
674	Lumbering in Pacific Northwest	1	Silent	Eastman	2
791.5	Marionettes—Construction and Manipulation	1	Sound	Handicraft	3
F	Merry Christmas	1	Sound	Castle	3
917.47	Mohawk Valley	1	Silent	Eastman	1
589.2	Mold and Yeast	1	Silent	Eastman	2
784	Music of the Nations	1	Sound	Gutlohn	3
500	Nature's Chemistry	1	Sound	Gutlohn	3
616.2	New Day	1	Sound	Metropolitan	1
909	News Parade, 1941	1	Sound	Castle	1
387	Ocean Liner	1	Silent	Eastman	2
784	Old Time Ballads	1	Sound	Gutlohn	3
630.6	On the Road to Tomorrow	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
917.95	Oregon Country	1	Silent	Eastman	2
342.73	Our Bill of Rights	2	Sound	Academic	6
918	Our Neighbors	3	Sound	CIAA	1
785	Overture to Rosamunde	1	Sound	Commonwealth	3
594	Oysters	1	Silent	Eastman	2
709.7	Patterns of American Rural Art	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
	People of Alaska	1	Sound	Erpi	3
919.69	People of Hawaii	1	Sound	Erpi	3

Wilson Catalog No.	Title	Reels	Silent or Sound	Producer	Unit Value
918.5	Peru	1	Silent	Eastman	2
632.7	Planting and Care of Trees	1	Silent	Eastman	2
613	Posture and Exercise	1	Sound	Erpi	3
661.3	Potash Production in America	3	Silent	American Potash	1
631.3	Power and the Land	4	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
917.295	Puerto Rico	1	Silent	Eastman	2
628.1	Purifying Water	1	Silent	Eastman	2
637	Quality Milk	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
	Revolution of the Americas	1	Sound	Erpi	3
355	Ring of Steel	1	Sound	OEM	1
917.12	Royal Parks	1	Sound	Canada	1
914.7	Russia	1	Silent	Eastman	2
323.4	Safeguarding Military Information	1	Sound	OEM	1
631.4	Save the Soil	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
628.3	Sewage Disposal	1	Silent	Eastman	2
739	Silver	1	Silent	Eastman	2
598.1	Snapping Turtle	1	Sound	Erpi	3
929.9	Story of the Flag	1	Sound	McCrary	3
738	Tableware	1	Silent	Eastman	2
358	Tanks	1	Sound	OEM	1
	Target for Tonight	4	Sound	OEM	3
386	Transportation on the Great Lakes	1	Silent	Eastman	2
616.24	Tuberculosis—How It May Be Avoided	1	Silent	Eastman	2
915.6	Turkey	2	Silent	Eastman	4
918.7	Venezuela	1	Sound	MMA	1
370	Village School	1	Sound	British L.	1
915.55	Virginia, The Old Domain	1	Silent	Eastman	2
940.54	Warning	3	Sound	Gutlohn	9
973	Westward Movement	1	Sound	Erpi	3
629.13	Wings of Youth	2	Sound	Canada	1
	Wood for War	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1
631.3	Worst of Farm Disasters	1	Sound	U. S. Agric.	1

CAVALCADE OF AMERICA RECORDINGS

The Constitution of the United States ..... 2 Units
Young Andy Jackson ..... 2 Units
Oliver Wendell Holmes, Poet ..... 2 Units

GENERAL RECORDINGS

Abe Lincoln in Illinois ..... 2 Units
Cavalcade of Presidents ..... 2 Units
Dickens' Christmas Carol ..... 2 Units
Roosevelt and Churchill Addresses, December 1941 ..... 2 Units

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XXII SEPTEMBER, 1942 No. 2

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Compiled by
E. R. RANKIN

Debate Handbook

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS
CHAPEL HILL MCMXLII

EXTENSION BULLETINS

Vol.	IV,	No. 12.	*Children of Old Carolina.* Historical Pageant for Children. Ethel T. Rockwell. Price 50c.
Vol.	VII.	No. 9.	*Special Legal Relations of Married Women in N. C. as to Property, Contracts, and Guardianships.* Mary P. Smith. Price 50c.
Vol.	VIII,	No. 5.	*The World Court.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	IX,	No. 4.	*The Classification of Property for Taxation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XII,	No. 5.	*The Sales Tax.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIII,	No. 3.	*Radio Control and Operation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV,	No. 1.	*Play Producing for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and staff members of the Carolina Playmakers. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV,	No. 2.	*Socialization of Medicine.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI,	No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of Electric Utilities.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI,	No. 4.	*Plays for Schools and Little Theatres (Revised).* Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII,	No. 3.	*Unicameral Legislatures.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII,	No. 4.	*First Principles of Play Direction.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVIII.	No. 2.	*Anglo-American Alliance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIX,	No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XX,	No. 3.	*Inter-American Relations.* Price 25c.
Vol.	XXI,	No. 1.	*Audio-Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* (Free).
Vol.	XXI,	No. 2.	*Hemisphere Defense.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XXII,	No. 1.	*Audio-Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* (Supplement). Free.
Vol.	XXII,	No. 2.	*Federal Aid to Education.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XXII,	No. 3.	*Sixth Annual N. C. School Art Exhibition.* 1942-43. (Free).
Vol.	XXII,	No. 4.	*Academic Contests for N. C. High Schools.* Announcement for the year 1942-43. (Free).

MONEY ORDERS, CHECKS, OR STAMPS ACCEPTED
ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION,
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XXII SEPTEMBER, 1942 No. 2

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Compiled by
E. R. RANKIN

Debate Handbook

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Page

Frank P. Graham, The High School Journal 35

George D. Strayer, at Institute of Education, Chapel Hill 37

Excerpts from pamphlet, National Education Association 39

P. V. McNutt, Hearings on S. 1313 before U. S. Senate 41

Jule B. Warren, Report of the Committee on Federal Aid 43

Lister Hill, The Journal of the National Education Association 44

Editorial, The High School Journal 46

F. W. Reeves, Hearings on S. 1313 in the U. S. Senate 48

Fred Engelhardt, The Nation's Schools 49

Clarence Heer, The Education Digest 50

NEGATIVE REFERENCES 52

Robert A. Taft, The American School Board Journal 52

David I. Walsh, Senate Report 56

J. J. Tigert, The Nation's Schools 61

Alexander Inglis, Educational Record 66

W. B. McPherson, The Nation's Schools 71

S. M. Brownell, School and Society 74

Paul C. Stetson, The Nation's Schools 77

Alfred E. Smith, The Nation's Schools 80

Editorial, The Greensboro Daily News 82

BIBLIOGRAPHY 84

THE HIGH SCHOOL DEBATING UNION

HISTORICAL SKETCH

The High School Debating Union was organized among the high schools of North Carolina by the Dialectic and Philanthropic literary societies of the University of North Carolina during the school year 1912-13. The query of that year was, RESOLVED, *That the constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow women to vote under the same qualifications as men.* Ninety schools participated in the first annual state-wide debate on February 22, 1913. Sixteen schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Pleasant Garden high school, represented by Grady Bowman and S. C. Hodgin, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on March 7, 1913.

One hundred and fifty schools took part in the second annual state-wide debate on March 20, 1914, on the subject, RESOLVED, *That the constitution of North Carolina should be so amended as to allow the initiative and referendum in state-wide legislation.* Forty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Winston-Salem high school, represented by Charles Roddick and Clifton Eaton, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 3, 1914. During the school year 1913-14 the High School Debating Union was incorporated as a regular feature of the work of the University Extension Division.

Two hundred and fifty schools took part in the third annual state-wide contest on March 26, 1915, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of subsidizing its merchant marine engaged in foreign trade.* Fifty schools won both debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Wilson high school, represented by Misses Lalla Rookh Fleming and Ethel Gardner, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 9, 1915.

The query which was discussed in the fourth annual state-wide contest on March 31, 1916, was, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of greatly enlarging its navy.* Three hundred and twenty-five schools enrolled for the contest. Sixty-eight schools won both of their debates and sent their speakers to Chapel Hill for the final contest. Miss Myrtle Cooper and Boyd Harden, speakers on the affirmative for the Graham high school, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 14, 1916.

Three hundred and thirty-one schools participated in the fifth annual state-wide debate, which was held on March 31, 1917, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the federal government should own and operate the railways.* Seventy-four schools won both of their debates and sent their debaters to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Waynesville high school, represented by Vinson Smathers and Roy Francis, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 20, 1917.

The sixth annual contest centered around the query, RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact a law providing for the compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes.* Three hundred schools participated in the triangular debates on March 29, 1918. Sixty-six schools won both debates and sent their

teams to Chapel Hill to enter the final contest. Thomas Burton and Will Anderson, representing the Wilson high school, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 12, 1918.

One hundred and eighty schools enrolled for the seventh annual state-wide debate on April 4, 1919, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States government should adopt a policy of requiring one year of military training for all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 21.* Forty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Durham high school, represented by Miss Aura Holton and Leo Brady, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on May 2, 1919.

Two hundred schools participated on April 14, 1920, in the eighth annual state-wide debate on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt a policy of further material restriction of immigration.* Forty-four schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University to take part in the final contest. The Asheville high school, represented by Arthur Kale and Clifton Ervin, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 28, 1920.

Two hundred schools participated in the ninth annual state-wide debating contest on April 1, 1921. The query was, RESOLVED, *That the policy of collective bargaining through trade unions should prevail in American industry.* Fifty schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. Miss Eunice Hutchins and Ludlow Rogers, of the Durham high school, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 15, 1921.

Two hundred and fifty schools took part in the tenth annual state-wide debate on March 24, 1922, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should enter the League of Nations.* Sixty schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill for the final contest. The Durham high school, represented by Linwood Hollowell and Freeman Twaddell, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 7, 1922.

Two hundred and fifty schools participated in the eleventh annual state-wide debate on March 31, 1923, on the query, RESOLVED, *That Congress should provide for the enforcement of decisions of the Railroad Labor Board.* Sixty schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Elizabeth City high school, represented by Misses Ellen Mellick and Mary Dozier, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 13, 1923.

Two hundred and fifty schools took part in the twelfth annual state-wide debate on March 28, 1924, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the inter-allied war debts should be cancelled.* Seventy-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Wilson high school, represented by Miss Catherine Ware and Fred Carr, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 11, 1924.

Two hundred and thirty-five schools entered the thirteenth annual state-wide contest on March 27, 1925. The query was, RESOLVED, *That North Caro-*

lina should ratify the port terminals and water transportation act. Sixty-five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. Miss Catherine Ware and Fred Carr, of the Wilson high school, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 10, 1925.

Two hundred and twenty-four schools took part in the fourteenth annual state-wide debate on April 2, 1926, on the query, RESOLVED, *That North Carolina should levy a state tax on property to aid in the support of an eight months school term.* Sixty-seven schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University for the final contest. The Winston-Salem high school, represented by Misses Mell Efird and Loretto Carroll, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 16, 1926.

Two hundred and twenty-three schools participated in the fifteenth annual state-wide debate on April 1, 1927, on the query, RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact the Curtis-Reed bill, providing for a federal department of education.* Sixty-seven schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. Harry Gump and Henry Biggs, of the Greensboro high school, representing the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 20, 1927.

One hundred and ninety-five schools entered the sixteenth annual state-wide debate which was held on April 6, 1928. The query for that year was, RESOLVED, *That Congress should enact the McNary-Haugen farm relief bill.* Fifty schools won both of their debates and sent their representatives to the University. The Washington Collegiate Institute, represented by Henry Roper and Hal Hopper, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 20, 1928.

One hundred and ninety-six schools participated in the seventeenth annual state-wide contest on April 5, 1929, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should join the World Court.* Fifty-nine schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. Floyd Adams and Shearod Crumpler, of the Roanoke Rapids high school, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 19, 1929.

One hundred and eighty-six schools took part in the eighteenth annual state-wide contest on April 4, 1930, on the query, RESOLVED, *That North Carolina should adopt the proposed constitutional amendment, authorizing the classification of property for taxation.* Fifty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Goldsboro high school, represented by Miss Eleanor Bizzell and Ezra Griffin, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 18, 1930.

Two hundred and eighteen schools entered on April 3, 1931, the nineteenth annual state-wide contest on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should grant immediate independence to the Philippines.* Fifty-two schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. Miss Marian Weil and Ezra Griffin, of Goldsboro, representing the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 17, 1931.

Two hundred and fourteen schools took part in the twentieth annual state-wide contest on April 1, 1932, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt a system of compulsory unemployment insurance.* Fifty-

five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. The Curry high school, represented by Miss Katherine Keister and Nash Herndon, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 15, 1932.

Two hundred and fifteen schools entered the twenty-first annual state-wide debate on March 31, 1933, on the query, RESOLVED, *That North Carolina should adopt the sales tax as a feature of its state system of revenue.* Fifty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their representatives to Chapel Hill. The Broughton high school, of Raleigh, represented by Miss Katherine Martin and Wade Marr, Jr., on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 14, 1933.

Two hundred schools participated in the twenty-second annual state-wide high school debate on March 30, 1934, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the essential features of the British system of radio control and operation.* Forty-five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Thomasville high school, represented by Miss Katherine Covington and A. C. Lovelace, Jr., on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 13, 1934.

Two hundred and twenty-five schools took part in the twenty-third annual state-wide high school debate on March 22, 1935, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of extending federal aid to general public education.* Sixty-eight schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. The Goldsboro high school, represented by Powell Bland and Maurice Edwards, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 12, 1935.

Two hundred and twenty-seven schools participated in the twenty-fourth annual state-wide high school debate on March 27, 1936, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the several states should provide for the socialization of medicine.* Sixty-four schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to Chapel Hill. The Kinston high school, represented by Miss Rose Pully and Miss Minetta Bartlett, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 17, 1936.

Two hundred and thirty-three schools participated in the twenty-fifth annual state-wide high school debate on April 2, 1937, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the government should own and operate all electric light and power utilities.* Sixty-three schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Weldon high school, represented by Miss Frances Johnson and Philip Moore, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 22, 1937.

Two hundred and thirty-four schools participated in the twenty-sixth annual state-wide high school debate on April 1, 1938, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the several states should adopt a unicameral system of legislation.* Sixty-six high schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Union Grove high school, represented by Miss Fern Templeton and Miss Wanona Rash, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 22, 1938.

Two hundred and thirty-seven schools took part in the twenty-seventh

annual state-wide high school debate on March 31, 1939, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should establish an alliance with Great Britain.* Sixty-one schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The High Point high school, represented by Kermit Albertson and George Humphreys, on the affirmative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 21, 1939.

Two hundred and twenty-five schools took part in the twenty-eighth annual state-wide high school debate on March 29, 1940, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should own and operate the railroads.* Fifty-five schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Monroe high school, represented by Moke Williams and Miss Elinor Ellwanger, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 19, 1940.

Two hundred and forty schools participated in the twenty-ninth annual state-wide high school debate on March 28, 1941, on the query, RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt a policy of requiring one year of military training of all able-bodied men before they reach the age of 23.* Sixty-four high schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Durham high school, represented by Charles Markham and Walter Cannon, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 18, 1941.

One hundred and fifty high schools took part in the thirtieth annual state-wide high school debate on March 27, 1942, on the query, RESOLVED, *That a union of western hemisphere nations should be established.* Thirty-five high schools won both of their debates and sent their teams to the University. The Rocky Mount high school, represented by Miss Margaret Fountain and Jennings Mangum, on the negative, won the Aycock Memorial Cup in the final debate on April 17, 1942.

THE QUERY FOR 1942-43

The query which will be discussed this year by the high schools holding membership in the High School Debating Union of North Carolina is: RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of extending federal aid to general public education.* Attention is directed to the statement of the query, with the accompanying explanations and limitations, on page 13 of the handbook.

The thanks of the compiler of this debate handbook are extended to the publishers and authors who very kindly gave permission for the re-printing of articles included in the handbook.

REGULATIONS

1. The University Extension Division of the University of North Carolina will suggest a query, to be discussed on a given date by the schools entering the High School Debating Union.

2. All secondary schools of North Carolina, however supported, offering regularly organized courses of study above the seventh grade, and not extending in their scope and content beyond a standard high school or secondary school course, shall be eligible for membership in the High School Debating Union.

3. The schools accepting this offer and thus becoming members of the Union shall be arranged into groups of three for triangular debates.

4. Each school of every triangular group shall agree to furnish two debating teams of two members each, the one to uphold the affirmative side of the query, and the other to defend the negative side.

5. The members of the debating teams must all be bona fide students of the schools they represent. To be bona fide students, they must be in regular attendance at the time of the debate, and they must have been in regular attendance for at least 30 per cent of the school year up to and including the date of the debate, and they must have made passing grades on a majority of the studies in some regularly organized course of study.

6. No post graduate of a high school shall be eligible to represent his school in the contest. Students who have been graduated already from high school, or awarded high school diplomas, are ineligible.

7. No student who became 21 years of age on or before September 1, 1942, shall be eligible to represent his school in the high school debates of the High School Debating Union.

8. The usual plan of procedure for the triangular contests will be for the affirmative teams to debate at home and for the negative teams to visit. However, whenever a plan for holding the debates on neutral grounds is favored by at least two member schools of a given triangle, then the debates of that triangle will be held on neutral territory.

9. The schools themselves shall select and agree upon the judges of the local contests.

10. In the triangular debates, each speaker shall have twenty minutes at his disposal, not more than fifteen of which shall be used in the first speech.

11. In the debates of the High School Debating Union, the order of the speakers in the first speech shall be: affirmative, negative, affirmative, negative. The order of speakers on rejoinder shall be: affirmative, negative, affirmative, negative. It is understood, however, that there is no objection to a reversal of this order of speakers on rejoinder in any given local debate, provided that such a reversal of order shall have been definitely agreed to beforehand by responsible authorities of both schools which are concerned in the given local debate.

12. The schools which shall win both of their debates shall be entitled to send their teams to the University to compete in the final contest for the Aycock Memorial Cup. It is understood, however, that the committee may arrange for an additional contest among the winning schools throughout the state prior to the final contest at the University, should this plan appear to be necessary under the circumstances. (It is understood that, due to war conditions, the final contest for the Aycock Cup may be omitted in the spring of 1943.)

13. In the event that one school of a triangle drops out and the committee at Chapel Hill is unable to secure a school to take its place, then the two schools remaining shall hold a dual debate with one another, with each school sending its team on the negative to the other.

14. In the event that two schools of a triangle drop out of the Union and the committee is unable to secure schools to take their places, then the remaining school shall be declared the winner over the others by their default.

15. The school having the strongest team on the affirmative side of the query and the school having the strongest team on the negative side shall be entitled to contest publicly at the University for the Aycock Memorial Cup. (The strongest team on each side of the query is to be determined by means of preliminary contests in debate at Chapel Hill. After a contestant has been eliminated in a preliminary at Chapel Hill in this year's final contest, the contestant will not be permitted to change sides and participate further in this year's final contest.)

16. The school which shall win the debate, thus finally held, shall have its name inscribed on the Aycock Memorial Cup.

17. Any school which shall win the final contest for two years in succession shall have the cup for its own property.

18. All contestants are expected to prepare their own speeches with legitimate assistance of the teachers, principals, or superintendents in their school systems. Legitimate assistance is interpreted to mean oral advice, suggestions, discussions, and criticism.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO JUDGES

1. The judges should be disinterested parties to the success of either team and, so far as possible, should be non-local.

2. They should sit apart during the debate.

3. They should judge the contest as a debate, and at its conclusion should vote "Affirmative" or "Negative" on the merits of the debate. They should not consider the merits of the question.

4. Each judge should sign and seal his vote and deliver it, through an usher, to the presiding officer who should publicly open the votes and announce the decision.

Before the debates begin, a copy of these suggestions should be given to each judge for his guidance.

ORIGINALITY OF DEBATERS

The committee realizes that "The debate which a speaker produces should be his very best; but it should under no circumstances be better than his best; that the success of the Union will be seriously hindered unless in each instance the speech of a debater represents his own individual work." It wishes, therefore, to ask the principals to give this matter their very careful consideration and to note particularly regulation 18. In cases where necessary, the principals in the various triangles should take such action among themselves as they deem necessary. Great care should be taken by all means to see to it that wherever a speaker uses any quoted material, proper credit is given in his speech to the source from which the quotation was derived.

For further information, address

C. E. McINTOSH, *Acting Secretary*
North Carolina High School Debating Union, Chapel Hill, N. C.

QUERY

RESOLVED, *That the United States should adopt the policy of extending federal aid to general public education.*

EXPLANATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

For the purpose of clarity of issue in the debates of the High School Debating Union of North Carolina, the following explanations and limitations of the meaning of the query are distinctly set down:

1. It is understood that the statement of the query, as this is given above, contemplates that Congress should appropriate annually at least $300,000,000 for the purpose of aiding general public education, elementary and secondary.

2. The affirmative may suggest, if it wishes, that the sums provided would be distributed on an automatic basis, with each state drawing a share of the total annual appropriation in accordance with the proportion which its population of school age, 5 to 17 inclusive, bears to the total population of school age of all the states; or the affirmative may suggest that each state would draw a share of the total annual appropriation in accordance with the proportion which its average attendance record for the previous year bears to the total average attendance record of all the states; or the affirmative might state that the funds would be distributed in accordance with a formula based on a combination of these two methods.

3. The affirmative may suggest, if it wishes, that the sums provided would be distributed on the basis of a formula using personal net income and school population (as under the plan, for instance, laid down in the pending bill S. 1313-substitute) in such a manner that at least three-fourths of the states would draw funds from the federal treasury in varying amounts for the aid of general public education, elementary and secondary; or the affirmative may state, if it desires, that one-half of the sums provided would be distributed to the several states and territories on an automatic basis, as explained in paragraph 2 above, and the other half would be distributed on the basis of a formula using personal net income and school population, as just explained in this paragraph. Under the pending bill, nine states and the District of Columbia would draw no funds from the federal treasury, and the remaining states and territories would draw varying amounts.

4. It will be incumbent upon each affirmative team to select the method of distribution which it will advocate from the several methods outlined in paragraphs 3 and 4 above. The negative must oppose any of these proposals for federal aid to general public education which the affirmative may advocate.

5. The states and territories receiving funds would place these amounts in support of their respective programs of general public education, elementary and secondary. It is understood that each state would have the right to expend not more than 20 per cent of its annual appropriation during any one year in the construction of school buildings.

6. It is understood that federal aid for vocational education, as this has been granted in the past to the different states by the federal government and as it is now granted, does not fulfill the requirements of this query for federal aid to general public education. The program of aid for vocational education is in the nature of aid for special purposes and is not in the nature of aid for general public education, as this subject is considered in the query outlined.

7. It is understood that any question as to the constitutionality of the proposed plan is to be waived from the discussions in the debates of the High School Debating Union of North Carolina.

GENERAL REFERENCES

EFFECTS OF THE WAR UPON PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE

(An article by Timon Covert in the American School Board Journal, volume 105, page 18, September, 1942.)

The situation created by the War has direct and significant effects upon public school finance and these touch both sides of the ledger.

On the debit side—Some of the difficulties the schools are experiencing as a result of various war activities are shortages of funds necessary to operate the schools.

Restrictions on the use of certain commodities are reducing the income of the public schools. For example, to mention only one. The restricted use (direct and indirect) of gasoline has already reduced the school revenue in those states which rely to a considerable extent upon gasoline taxes for their state school funds. A somewhat different effect results from restrictions on the use of rubber for private cars. This restriction has increased the demand for pupil transportation by school district vehicles and in some instances has caused greater expense to the school system, since many children previously rode to school in private cars without expense to the school district.

As a result of the acquisition of territory by the federal government for various purposes connected with our war effort, some school districts have lost as much as 50 per cent of their taxable property without the loss of a proportionate part of their pupils.

In many school communities, and this has touched school districts of various sizes, scholastic populations have greatly increased by the influx of the families of workers in war industries.

And in all sections of the country, school districts are faced with rising prices for services and materials which they use.

On the credit side—There are evidences of improvement in school finance which result directly or indirectly from the war situation.

The national income is rising as a result of the great effort being put forth in industry, in agriculture, and in other occupations. As a result tax collections have improved and public revenues, including those for schools, have increased. While the improvements in financial conditions are more marked in some localities than in others, they are in evidence in every state.

In some instances the shift in population has reduced the scholastic population. This situation, however, will seldom result in significantly lower school costs, for any reduction in general overhead costs due to smaller enrollment is likely to be overbalanced by the increasing costs we are experiencing.

Dedicated taxes versus general fund appropriations—The problem created by the diminishing returns from state taxes dedicated to the schools, as reported from Texas and a few other states, calls attention to methods of allotting revenues to state school funds. In case the proceeds of a given tax become inadequate, another tax, of course, can be levied in lieu of the one which is failing. Since the state provides funds to meet the financial obliga-

tions of the state to its schools, however, would it not be better to draw upon the state's general fund? The proceeds of a given tax may or may not yield sufficiently year after year. Furthermore, there is the other argument that all services of government should be considered in the formulation of the state's budget rather than to select a favorably yielding tax and allot its proceeds to one particular government function.

Problems of war congested areas—Regarding the unusually difficult problems of boards of education in those districts and localities where the federal government has acquired a considerable part of the taxable property or where large numbers of children are brought into the locality, it can be said that a partial solution is now under way. Although these problems are not new, they have been multiplied in number and size by the present war efforts. In either situation the city or small school district often finds it next to impossible to finance the additional burden, especially on such short notice as usually happens. Neither school budgets nor taxes can be adjusted without considerable delay.

The assistance now being given by the federal government for the education of children in areas congested by war activities is in the form of grants and loans for school buildings and, under certain circumstances, for salaries of teachers. The need in any case must, of course, be approved. At present the opinion seems to prevail that the federal government should continue to lend its assistance in the solution of such problems. Certainly it is only just and fair that the federal government provide funds for reimbursing the state or local school district in which the federal government owns tax-exempt property.

But the state government, too, has an obligation to come to the rescue of its local districts in distress. Fortunately a few states have provisions in their laws which enable the state officials to assist local districts with these problems. Most states, however, do not provide adequately for financial emergencies in their local school districts.

Increasing costs—The following are a few of the principal causes of increasing costs reported by school systems: increasing costs of supplies; increase in transportation costs; increase in teachers' salaries; addition of vocational training courses; increase in costs of insurance; and general inflationary prices of all commodities and services.

Many school systems are attempting to meet the increasing school costs with current revenues. Economies are effected and borrowing is avoided wherever possible. The final solution, of course, usually means higher taxes. From one state, Indiana, comes the report that a flat increase of $100 per teacher will be allotted by the state to local districts.

Many cities and states report increased revenues as a result of the war activities. The schools, of course, are likely to share in the good fortune. Surpluses are reported in North Carolina where the state ended its fiscal year with a surplus of $17,000,000; in Alabama with a surplus of $25,000,000; and in New York with a surplus of $54,000,000.

Good use, no doubt, is being made of the increase in most cases. For example, some city school systems are building up sinking funds to retire in-

debtedness; others are planning to accumulate a surplus for a time when incomes may not be so good.

It is to be hoped that out of the present situation and the likely situation of the postwar period great improvement in financing the public schools will take place. If the people of those states, whose schools have experienced financial difficulty during recent years, would revise their plans for administering and financing their public schools in the light of studies already made, much future difficulty would be avoided.

We have been a wasteful people. It is doubtful if we can continue to be so wasteful in the future. If there are ways in which our plans for school administration and finance can be improved it behooves us to make such improvements without further delay. If economies of any kind can be made in school administration and finance without injury to the schools, now is an excellent time to put such economies into effect.

URGE CORRELATION OF SCHOOLS TO WAR

(An article as carried under a Washington date line in the New York Times for September 1, 1942.)

Revision of high school programs, modification of college entrance examinations and other adjustments designed to correlate schools to the war, were adopted at today's closing session of the Institute on Education and the War.

The obligation of institutions of learning to cooperate actively and without delay with government agencies in winning the war was unanimously accepted by the delegates. The extent to which they will be able to discharge that obligation depended on funds to be contributed by the federal government, it was explained.

Failure of the government to assist in financing wartime programs not only has had "a deterring influence on the rate and efficiency of performance" but has cast doubt on the reality of "the alleged need of the armed forces and their auxiliaries for trained man power," said Dr. Raymond A. Kent, president of the University of Louisville.

It is not yet too late to rectify, at least in some degree, this error," Dr. Kent said.

Senator Thomas of Utah agreed that federal aid was essential to the war, and predicted that it would be forthcoming. Harley L. Lutz, Princeton professor of public finance, warned that the extent, if any, to which it would or could be provided was dependent on the adoption on the part of the government of a wiser fiscal policy, specifically "the proper use of the taxing power."

"You should know," he said, "that there can be nothing more than the thinnest camouflage in any scheme to save education by a federal subsidy unless the federal finances are in such flourishing condition as to provide that subsidy out of a surplus of current revenue over other expenditures.

"The issue of war finance is now directly before us. It is not being handled

well, despite the long and wearisome hours that have been devoted to it by Congressional committees.

"The reason for the failure to grapple with this issue more vigorously and more courageously is because of our departure from the plain and simple principle of sound finance, namely, that deliberate deficit financing is always contrary to common sense and is likely, in the end, to be contrary to common honesty.

"The end of the fiscal road we are now traveling is the chaos and destruction of debt repudiation."

The most urgent present tax problem, according to Dr. Lutz, is to devise a system of proportional income taxation "that will reach all except the smallest individual incomes," and for that purpose he proposed the transformation of the normal tax into a tax on current incomes at source, plus a sales tax.

"Both are necessary in my opinion in order to permit the rate of each to be moderate," he said.

Because of "the waste since 1930 of billions, due to which we are now so much closer to the breaking point," and because also of the development of "an easy money attitude," the return to "sensible basis of government financing will be all the more difficult," Dr. Lutz said. He conceded "the present practical necessity of some borrowing," though "far less than is actually in prospect."

Dr. Kent argued, however, that "to bring victory and peace" colleges and universities must continue in maximum capacity the needed programs and to that end wartime federal aid must be given "to the institutions for the additional maintenance costs to which it may be put, to the student for wartime courses and curricula pursued on an accelerated basis and to the faculty members who should not be expected to contribute their services without adequate compensation."

The plight of the teachers, in an era of steadily rising costs, was emphasized by Senator Thomas and by Leon Henderson, price administrator.

"In general the cost of living has advanced 15 per cent or more within the last year," Mr. Thomas said. "Teachers' salaries, in general, especially in our rural schools, remain static. Nearly everywhere teachers can double and triple their salaries by going into defense industry. We now face the test as to whether our national government believes that educational opportunity, free and open to all, is really a cornerstone of freedom and democracy."

Discussing teachers' salaries and cost of living, Mr. Henderson said that the levels today were about the same as the first World War. With the present cost of living up 18 per cent the real wage value has decreased to 80 per cent of actual current wages, he said.

Calling attention to "an inevitable reduction in financial aid to schools through reduced taxes in the years immediately ahead," he urged "full protection of the economic security of teachers as this situation develops."

Mr. Henderson emphasized the importance of the education of the public in the need for price control and rationing and stressed the role of the teachers in this field of instruction.

HOW ILLITERATE ARE WE?

(An article in the Statistical Bulletin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, volume 23, pages 1-3, June, 1942.)

A grossly misleading impression as to the educational attainments and intelligence of America's young men, as well as of American educational opportunities in general, has been created by the publication simultaneously of statistics on army deferments because of "literacy" requirements and of the proportion of our adult population 25 years or more of age with less than five years of schooling. These crude figures are an utterly inadequate measure of the mental equipment of men of draft age. When subjected to careful analysis, these educational statistics are found to be as poor an index of the literacy of our American people as were the crude figures on army rejections for physical defects as an index of the health status of our population.

From the fact that 430,000 men have been deferred for army service because of inability to meet the army's educational requirements, and from the fact that 10,000,000 persons over age 25, according to the 1940 census, had less than five years' schooling, the inference has been drawn that there is an appalling lack of education among our young people. As a matter of fact, the two sets of facts are quite unrelated. The army has, for good and understandable reasons, set an educational standard which is distinctly more severe than that applied in the first World War. This is entirely justified in view of the great importance and large-scale use of machines and other complicated equipment used by our new army. To assume, however, from the army's action, that persons with less education are illiterate or unintelligent, is a rash generalization. Certainly, in civil life—and in military life, too, for that matter—many have attained prominence who possessed no greater educational advantages than the present minimum requirements of the selective service. In our own history, there are such famous examples as Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Franklin, Andrew Jackson, Horace Greeley, Walt Whitman, Mark Twain, and Thomas A. Edison, all of whom had little or no formal schooling.

An element of confusion in the situation arises out of indiscriminate use of the word "illiteracy"—inability to read or write—which had been the distinction used in census investigations prior to 1940. This term has been confused both with the inability to meet the army's intelligence standard, which is not based on a specific amount of schooling, and with the new census classification of less than five years of schooling. Obviously, these are not the same. Indeed, the very fact that the basis of census statistics regarding the educational status of our adult population was shifted upward in 1940, for the first time, from frank illiteracy to the amount of schooling received, is a clear indication of the educational progress of the nation as a whole.

The facts with regard to schooling among persons 25 or more years old not only fail to indicate the educational status of young people today, and of draftees, but reflect rather the educational conditions of a generation or two ago which, consequently, are now largely beyond repair. The school ages of a great majority of these persons date back more than 20 years. New census figures just released, based on a 5 per cent sample of the 1940 population,

show that among men in the broad age group 18 to 44, only 5.3 per cent had failed to complete four years of grade school. At ages under 25 this proportion was slightly under 4 per cent. Moreover, in the white male population under age 25, those with less than four years' schooling comprised only a little more than 2 per cent of the total, and in the northern and western sections of the country, only 1 per cent in this significant age group.

Illiteracy, as well as insufficient schooling, is concentrated pretty much in three groups—namely, survivors of the pre-1914 immigration, negroes, and white persons from certain sections of the rural south. The foreign-born and negroes together accounted for 71 per cent of the adults with less than one year of schooling in the census of 1940, although they formed only 23 per cent of the entire population.

The proportion of those totally illiterate has been declining steadily, and even in the past ten years there has been a marked reduction. Thus, among persons 25 or more years of age in 1940, only 3.7 per cent had no schooling (some of whom undoubtedly could read and write), as compared with 5.6 per cent of frank illiteracy of the persons in this age group in 1930. Among white persons, the comparable percentages were 3.1 for 1940 and 3.7 for 1930; among negroes, 10.0 and 21.3 respectively. The efforts to wipe out illiteracy in this country during the last decade have met with great success, especially among negroes.

The educational picture in this country is seen in far better perspective from the current situation with respect to children and young persons of school age. Regarding these, the census of 1940 reveals that the proportion attending school was 69.1 per cent at 6 years of age, 94.7 per cent between ages 7 and 15, and 56.2 per cent at ages 15 to 19. At ages 10 to 13, when four years or more of schooling have usually been completed, the proportion was at its maximum—95.5 per cent. In most places in this country the figure is as close to 100 per cent as it can be, and the remainder is made up chiefly by those children who, for physical or mental reasons, are ineducable. But there are admittedly some bad spots in the country, where educational facilities are quite inadequate for all children, white or colored. Whatever the reasons for these deficiencies, efforts should be continued to wipe them out.

THE FUTURE OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

(Excerpts from an article by Joseph P. Harris in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 207, pages 14-26, January, 1940.)

Federal aid may be said to be at a midway point. Prior to 1930 it was relatively small in amount (except the highway grants), and was limited to a few major functions regarded for some reason as objects of national interest; now it has become very large in amount, totaling over one-half billion dollars from regular appropriations, and has been expanded to a wider range of governmental services. It is destined to become even larger. Formerly it was utilized largely as a device for stimulating the states to under-

take a few favored activities; now the emphasis has shifted from stimulation to support, and the federal government shares with the states and the localities the cost of an increasing number of expensive functions. Formerly the federal government might disregard the effects of federal aid in stimulating the aided activities at the expense of other functions, and, indeed, regard the stimulating effect with satisfaction as carrying out the purpose of the federal legislation; now the serious effects of federal aid in distorting state and local budgets need to be taken into account.

In view of the size and importance of federal aid, and its probable increasing future role, the time has come for the federal government to adopt a more consistent, rational policy, and to correct some of the existing defects which experience has indicated in existing policies and administration. It is suggested that some of the important elements of such a national policy on federal aid include the following:

1. Greater attention should be given to the effects of federal aid on the whole structure of state and local finance, with particular attention as to how it affects unaided activities, and steps should be taken to lessen the undue, permanent preference now given to particular functions or parts of functions which receive federal aid. The steps to be taken might include a broadening of the purposes of federal aid, thus avoiding the favoring of certain functions; and revision of the terms of federal aid. The unlimited percentage grants for expensive governmental services should be abandoned.

2. More careful attention should be given to the amount of federal aid to be provided for each aided function, based upon better factual data of the need for the service throughout the country. It is highly desirable to curtail the power of special interest groups to lobby through appropriations for federal aid, and to establish more definite responsibility for the passing upon appropriations with a view to national rather than special interests.

3. The method of distribution of federal aid should be given more careful attention in the future, with less use of rule-of-thumb methods of allocation. Total population is too rough a measure of the need for a particular service to serve as a basis of distribution, particularly for expensive services, and simple percentage grants are undesirable. One solution would be to authorize the administrative agency in charge, under suitable statutory provisions, to determine the need for the service in each state, to be used as the basis for distribution. Greater attention will also need to be given to the financial abilities of the several states, particularly where a minimum national standard of service is desired.

4. The maintenance of reasonable standards of administration is of the utmost concern to the federal government as a protection against unwise and improvident expenditure of federal aid. The simple faith in the efficacy of the matching requirement as a means of assuring satisfactory administration is not supported by actual experience. The standards of administration of state and local governments are, unfortunately, frequently low. Experience indicates that the federal agency administering federal aid may exert considerable influence in improving state and local administration by the insist-

ence upon a merit system in personnel and nonpolitical administration, the provision of technical services and research, the building up of professional standards and techniques, the interchange of information and experience among the administrative officials of the several states, and in other ways. Congress should hold the administrative agencies in charge responsible for insistence upon satisfactory administrative standards—many of which might well be specified in the statute—without undue interference or dictation in routine matters, and should grant adequate authority to enable the agency to carry out that responsibility.

"CRISIS" IN EDUCATION

(An editorial in the Charlotte Observer for August 14, 1942.)

Around 25 per cent of the school teachers of North Carolina have quit their posts.

The dilemma posed by this situation is being regarded as a "crisis" in public education in the state. And so it may well be estimated.

This loss of teaching power is not immediately replaceable.

Indeed, it may be years before the loss can be compensated. That depends upon the war, as does every other interest, both public and private.

Teachers have left the schools, both men and women, because they can earn more elsewhere—that, in addition, to the war responsibilities which many of them have undertaken. They can make two or three times, often much more than that, in employment created by war conditions.

While the problem in this state, as well as elsewhere over the nation, is made more acute by the demand for man power and woman power in government work or war industries, there are symptoms about it of a chronic and continuing trend.

Graduates of colleges are not trekking to the schools as teachers as they used to. The profession's recruits are dwindling.

There is little for them in the way of prospect for promotion to allure them or in the way of earning enough upon which comfortably to get along.

In the case of young men, business opportunities are magnetic. They can become stenographers, clerks and secretaries at far more than they can command as teachers in the public schools.

So far as young men are concerned, only those who feel they have a special aptitude for teaching—formerly this was called a "calling"—are interested. They are increasingly turning their backs upon the profession.

Even though, therefore, no extraordinary national crisis existed, the public schools would face this problem to some degree.

So far as North Carolina is concerned, the immediate teacher shortage is only one phase of the growingly perplexing school problem.

Other interferences of a major nature must be confronted. It begins to look as if the disruption and disorganization will reach extreme proportions.

There is the additional problem of bus transportation for the rural children. North Carolina hauls more than 300,000 of these children to and from school. That's one-tenth of the total number of children in the whole nation who have bus facilities. To serve them the state operates 4900 buses.

Inevitably the law must be changed so that the administering authorities will not be compelled to haul children who live near the schools, as is now the case.

Buses must be radically curtailed. No new vehicles are obtainable and no new tires available for those now in use. If the war drags on for many years, one can clearly foresee the time when no bus transportation at all will be offered unless there is a miracle in rubber.

It is important, of course, to keep the educational system going as fully and efficiently as all available means will permit, but that the present procedures and techniques of organization and operation must be sharply revised there can be no question.

Better to let even this indispensably good cause suffer for an interim than to jeopardize the war effort of the nation.

If that should not succeed, there will be no educational system in the nation at all fashioned after the free, democratic American style.

And any other sort is worse than ignorance and illiteracy.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS UNDER THE PENDING FEDERAL AID BILL

The pending federal aid to education bill (S. 1313-substitute) would apportion from the federal treasury $300,000,000 annually for the support of general public education, elementary and secondary.

Of this amount, $5,000,000 would be set aside for distribution by the U. S. Commissioner of Education to the outlying possessions of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam.

The remainder, $295,000,000, would be appropriated among 41 states and territories under a formula based on personal net income and school population. Nine states and the District of Columbia would not receive funds under the pending bill.

The amounts which the various states would receive under the pending bill, as these figures were announced on March 19, 1942 by the legislative commission of the National Education Association, are as follows:

Alabama, $16,048,000; Arizona, $1,622,500; Arkansas, $11,180,500; California, no funds; Colorado, $2,743,500; Connecticut, no funds; Delaware, no funds; District of Columbia, no funds; Florida, $4,867,500; Georgia, $15,-133,500; Idaho, $2,183,000; Illinois, no funds; Indiana, $8,614,000; Iowa, $8,260,000; Kansas, $6,372,000; Kentucky, $14,278,000; Louisiana, $10,118,-

500; Maine, $2,743,500; Maryland, no funds; Massachusetts, no funds; Michigan, $6,844,000; Minnesota, $7,345,500; Mississippi, $12,950,500; Missouri, $8,761,500; Montana, $1,062,000.

Nebraska, $4,454,500; Nevada, no funds; New Hampshire, $1,003,000; New Jersey, no funds; New Mexico, $2,625,500; New York, no funds; North Carolina, $20,443,500; North Dakota, $3,333,500; Ohio, $7,906,000; Oklahoma, $10,531,500; Oregon, $1,622,500; Pennsylvania, $16,343,000; Rhode Island, $413,000; South Carolina, $11,652,500; South Dakota, $3,038,500; Tennessee, $13,363,500; Texas, $22,980,500; Utah, $2,271,500; Vermont, $1,062,000; Virginia, $10,679,000; Washington $1,563,500; West Virginia, $8,761,500; Wisconsin, $7,778,000; Wyoming, $649,000; Alaska, $59,000; and Hawaii, $1,327,500.

STATE ENDS YEAR WITH SURPLUS

(Excerpts from an article appearing in the Raleigh News and Observer for July 31, 1942.)

North Carolina closed the fiscal year ending June 30 with a breath-taking general-fund surplus of $18,988,155, greater by almost $12,000,000 than any other surplus in the state's history, Governor Broughton announced yesterday.

The size of the surplus can be seen from the fact that it is 39 per cent of the state's actual expenditures during the year.

The surplus was piled up in revenue collections which sharply exceed estimates rather than in savings in expenditures as compared with estimated expenditures. Revenue for the year was estimated to be $44,699,411 and it actually was $57,649,331. Expenditures for the year were estimated to be $47,188,768 and expenditures actually were $46,543,157.

The state began the fiscal year with a surplus of $7,280,272, the previous high mark for North Carolina.

Biggest gainer in the revenue field was the income tax. Its yield for the year originally was estimated at $15,096,969, while the actual yield was $22,552,439. The big income tax gain can be attributed directly to war-boom conditions in the state.

Next biggest gainers in the tax field was the sales levy. It brought in $15,663,490, as compared with an estimate of $13,100,000. The beverage tax estimate was $2,212,000 and actual collections were $3,518,376.

When the 1941 legislature was preparing the budget for the current biennium, it estimated the surplus as of July 1 this year would be $5,392,694. Actually the surplus is the record-breaking figure of $18,988,155.

That means that revenue during this current year could fall off as much as $13,000,000 and the state could end the year with a balanced budget.

AN EDUCATED ARMY

(An editorial in the Charlotte Observer for August 9, 1942.)

It is the unqualified assertion of Roscoe Drummond, one of the ablest of the consistently able corps of specialist writers for the Christian Science Monitor, that "the 1942 edition of the American soldier is the most educated fighting man in the world today."

He goes on to prove his case by citing that today 11 per cent of the white selectees have had a college education. In World War I only 5 per cent had a college education.

Today 30 per cent of the citizen army are high school graduates. In World War I only 4 per cent were high school graduates.

Today 28 per cent have one or more years of high school training. In the last war only 12 per cent were high school nongraduates.

It takes more than college training and high school instruction to make an effective soldier, but, all things else being equal, the soldier with this asset is more efficiently prepared for his job than the unlearned and illiterate.

Modern warfare demands, first of all, the sharpened wit, the quick and accurate mental process, the ability to think and plan and blueprint and the knowledge to work out the plans that have first been sketched for the prosecution of the tactics and techniques of warfare.

The American educated soldier, with his high school and college background, should have the advantage which Mr. Drummond detects and deduces from the facts.

AFFIRMATIVE REFERENCES

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

(Excerpts from an address by Elbert D. Thomas in the U. S. Senate, June 18, 1942.)

On May 29 of this year our newspapers carried a report that the President of the United States, after conference with the United States commissioner of education and the director of selective service, proposed to project a program of adult education to alleviate a situation revealed by the fact that 433,000 men of draft age have been found to be without sufficient education —fourth grade—to serve in the army, about 250,000 of whom—enough for 15 divisions in the army—are physically fit.

Something needs to be done now to eradicate functional illiteracy and to prevent its recurrence in the future.

Apparently the American people learned little from their experience in the last war with respect to the equalization of educational opportunity. The American Academy of Science reported in 1919 that an examination of 1,500,000 men in the draft of the first World War revealed that 25.3 per cent could not read a newspaper or write a letter home. The report should have aroused the nation. It should have prompted Congress to undertake a vigorous program of federal aid to education in the states in order to equalize educational opportunity and thus help to prevent a new generation of illiterates.

More than 20 years ago a commission of the National Education Association, moved by the disclosures of illiteracy among our draftees, prepared for Congress a bill to provide federal participation in the support of education in the several states. In one form or another, a similar proposal has been before Congress for the past six years.

According to the information available, it appears that about 20 per cent of our men of military age, excluding the mentally deficient, are functionally illiterate. In the last war, as has already been stated, the percentage was 25.3. At this rate functional illiteracy among the mentally competent of our population will be eradicated scarcely before the end of the next 100 years.

Data from the 1940 census show that 10,104,612 persons 25 years of age and older have completed not more than four years of schooling. That number is 13.57 per cent of the population of that age group. Official reports do not reveal the states from which the functionally illiterate draftees come, but it seems a safe assumption that they come from the states in about the same proportion as the persons reported by the bureau of the census. The census data show that every state has a sizable share of persons of low educational status. The southern states—including Texas, Oklahoma, and Kentucky—have 4,486,760 of them; the northern states—east of the Mississippi, including West Virginia and Maryland—have 4,336,800; and the western states have 1,281,052. The percentages run from 4.1 per cent in Iowa to 35.7 per cent in Louisiana. When it is recalled that our population is highly mobile, nearly 25 per cent of the native-born now living in states other than those of their birth, it can be safely concluded that the states which have

the most widely available educational opportunities import a share of their illiterates and near-illiterates from the states where educational opportunities are not as widely available as they should be.

Certainly the last war and this one should have taught us that the availability and quality of educational opportunity in every nook and corner of the union is a matter of concern to the nation. In this time of total war, we need every available and potential economic and human resource. The fifteen armed divisions are not merely a loss to our military power; they are also a loss to our productive power. They will produce no aircraft or other complicated machines for modern warfare; and without the rudiments of modern schooling, there is no way to enable them to do so. It is probably true that fifteen additional divisions of armed and equipped soldiers would have turned the tide of any decisive battle in history, from Marathon to Argonne.

It is by no means sufficient, important as it is, that we merely try to provide schools for these neglected people now that the crisis is upon us. Illiteracy, the product of educational neglect, must be stopped at its source; and that can be done only by giving educational opportunity to the children—all the children of all the people of America.

In 1937 Senator Harrison of Mississippi jointly with the then chairman of the senate committee on education and labor, Senator Black of Alabama, introduced a bill to provide financial assistance to the states for public education. That bill was favorably reported after extensive hearings by the senate committee on education and labor. While the bill was before the house committee on education, and hearings were being held, the President requested the advisory committee on education, previously appointed by him to study federal aid for vocational education, to give more extended consideration to the whole subject of federal relationship to state and local conduct of education, and to prepare a report. Thereafter, the Congress took no further action in the matter pending the report of the President's advisory committee on education.

On February 8, 1938, the President's committee transmitted its report to the President. The report was published by the committee, and also as house document No. 529, seventy-fifth Congress, third session. The committee found by unanimous agreement that—

"The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the nation's children are below any level that should be tolerated in a civilized country."

And that—

"unless the federal government participates in the financing of schools and related services, several millions of children in the United States will continue to be largely denied the educational opportunities that should be regarded as their birthright."

The senator from Mississippi and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's advisory committee. After extensive hearings before a sub-committee of the committee on education and labor in the seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the bill, S. 1305, was reported to

the senate with the recommendation that it pass. Because of several circumstances which it is not necessary to relate here, the bill died on the calendar of the seventy-sixth Congress.

In 1941 Senator Harrison and I introduced another bill, senate bill 1313, to provide federal assistance to the states for education. Extensive hearings were held on the bill. One important aspect of that bill was the proposal to grant financial assistance to the states in providing for school facilities in defense areas. Since that time grants have been made available through public law 137, known as the Lanham act, and sometimes referred to as the community facilities act. Under these new conditions it appears that the greatest need for federal assistance in education is for funds for the equalization of elementary and secondary educational opportunities among and within the states. Accordingly, on February 11, 1942, the senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] and I submitted to the committee on education and labor the committee print of a bill to provide such funds. On June 12, 1942, we submitted another committee print, carrying minor changes in the first committee print. We now propose to report a corresponding bill from the committee, and to call on the senate for action. I shall summarize briefly the reasons for this proposal.

There are wide differences in the extent and quality of public school programs in the various states. These differences are of long and continuous standing, and account chiefly for the appalling extent of illiteracy and near illiteracy already referred to.

These inequalities of educational opportunity are the reflection of the inequalities in the ability of the states to support public schools and of the inequalities of the burdens the states have to bear. They are not due to the lack of effort on the part of the states with the least financial ability.

Some persons seem to think that every state could support an adequate school program without unreasonably great effort. They are mistaken. If Mississippi were to maintain as high an educational standard as that maintained by Delaware, it would have to make more than twelve times as much effort as that made by Delaware. Such states as Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Georgia cannot possibly from their own resources, maintain educational programs for their children comparable to the educational programs maintained in such states as New Jersey, California, New York, and Delaware. Obviously without financial assistance many states cannot provide suitable educational opportunities for every child.

But mere measures of per capita financial ability do not measure the great differences in the ability of the states to support schools. The states with the lowest financial resources have far greater numbers of children in proportion to the number of adults than do the states with the highest financial resources.

One often hears the statement that inequalities of educational opportunity among the states are chiefly due to the failure of certain states to make as great a financial effort to support schools as do other states. This statement is not true. Of the twelve states which make the greatest effort, not one is among the twelve highest with respect to expenditures per pupil. Of the twelve states making the least effort, six are among the twelve spending the most per pupil.

Such states as Alabama, Arkansas, South Carolina, and Mississippi are able to spend only about one-fifth as much per pupil for education as do New York, New Jersey, and California. Can a state hire teachers at an average salary of $559 a year and expect them to be as competent as the teachers employed by another state for $2,604 a year? If children in different sections of the nation are to have similar opportunities for learning, they must have teachers of approximately the same qualifications. Such a condition can hardly exist when salary levels differ as widely as they do now.

In addition to the general need for partial equalization of school opportunities among the states, there has long been a need for more funds for negro schools. This need has recently been brought into sharp focus by the decisions of federal courts that under the constitution no discrimination on the basis of race or color may be made in the payment of teachers' salaries. To provide equal salaries for all teachers having the same qualifications and responsibilities, it will be necessary in many of the states to lower the salaries of white teachers, or to curtail the present school program, or to obtain adequate federal aid. Obviously, the third possibility is the only socially constructive one.

Federal aid for education is directly related to the war effort. Certainly in the current effort to win the war we must look to the future. Every year a new crop of young people come through our schools. It is not inconceivable that boys now in the elementary grades may become old enough to bear arms before the war is won. What the nation does now about their education will determine to no small degree what they are able to do for the nation tomorrow. It is these same children now of school age who will bear the brunt of the post-war reconstruction. It is inconceivable that the nation should fail at this time to make available everywhere the schooling so necessary to a full realization of winning the peace as well as the war.

Practically every economist knows, and many of them have said, that federal aid for education is a necessary part of the post-war program of the national government. The question is whether we shall wait until calamities more dire than those following the first World War shall be permitted to strike our public schools before any constructive effort in their behalf is undertaken.

There is already a rapidly developing shortage of teachers, especially in our rural schools. It is perfectly obvious that in many cases the revenues of state governments will, within another year, suffer sharp declines. The necessary program for winning the war and its economic effects will inevitably result in curtailment of state funds. In the very states with the least economic resources there is generally the greatest dependence upon state funds for public school support. Thus, in the very areas where school facilities are most meagre, the financial calamity will hit hardest and quickest.

In general, the cost of living has advanced 15 per cent or more within the last year. Teachers' salaries, in general, especially in our rural schools, remain static. Nearly everywhere, rural teachers can double and triple their salaries by going into defense industry. We now face the test as to whether our national government believes that educational opportunity, free and open to all, is really a cornerstone of freedom and democracy.

The bill for federal aid for education, proposed by the senator from Alabama and myself, is a simple and direct measure, based upon sound principles. Its chief characteristics are these:

First. It provides specifically that "the control and supervision of public schools shall remain solely a state function, or a local function under state law." It specifically states that no federal "department, agency, or officer shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act."

Second. The funds will be appropriated to states according to need as determined by a formula based on the number of persons five to seventeen years old and the personal net income in the respective states.

Third. Each state will provide through its legislature for a plan whereby the funds received will be apportioned to its respective local school jurisdictions in some manner that will fit the situation in that state so as effectively to lessen inequalities of educational opportunities.

Fourth. Full recognition is given to the right of the states to maintain separate schools for children of the minority races, while at the same time ample provision is made for increasing the financial support of the separate schools. In states which maintain separate schools for separate races, the minority races will be allotted their pro rata share of the federal funds in proportion to population without reduction of the proportion of state and local moneys expended during the fiscal year ended in 1941 for public schools of minority races.

THE NATIONAL INTEREST IN EDUCATION

(Excerpts from the Report of the Advisory Committee on Education, pages 23-32, published February 23, 1938.)

If the educational programs of local communities and states could and would accomplish all of the purposes that are vital to the nation as a whole, the federal government would not need to participate in education. Past federal participation in education has been necessitated by the fact that local programs never have been adequate to accomplish all vital national purposes. Their relative inadequacy is increasing, not because they do not improve, but because in many cases they fall further and further behind the needs.

The ability of states and local communities to provide education has always been unequal. That inequality has been magnified, however, by the great changes in social and economic conditions. At the same time, all of the social services, including education, have become increasingly important.

Fundamentally, the differentials in opportunity that now exist are to a considerable extent due to a drainage of wealth from all parts of the country into the towns and cities and particularly into the great metropolitan areas. Part of that drainage takes place as a result of migration. Many of the people who migrate have reached retirement age with substantial means; still more are in the age groups of greatest productivity. One of the great causes of the relative poverty of rural regions is the fact that, under present circum-

stances, future city people are fed and taught largely at the expense of the farmer.

Our structure of manufacturing, commerce, and finance is such that the small towns and rural areas pay tribute to the great centers. The effect of the corporate form of organization is to concentrate commercial and industrial wealth. Dividends from that wealth might be distributed back to their local sources if stockholders saw fit to distribute their places of residence more uniformly throughout the various regions. In actual practice, large stockholders in particular frequently make special effort to establish their residence at points where they will be least subject to state and local taxation for the support of social services.

No doubt it would be well if every school jurisdiction in the country had taxable wealth in approximate proportion to its school needs. Any policy that would tend to equalize local taxpaying ability would automatically ease the school problem to a corresponding extent. If every locality were equally provided with taxable resources for education, there would be little need for federal participation in the financial support of education.

But there is small prospect of action in agriculture, social security, or other fields on a scale that would thoroughly equalize the economic opportunity of American youth regardless of birthplace. We must deal, therefore, with a situation in which for American youth opportunity is a birthright attached to certain families and certain geographic areas. A child born in those favored places has opportunity plus; one born outside has opportunity minus.

For equalization purposes, the most efficient taxes are the federal graduated taxes on incomes and estates—that is, these taxes give more equalization per dollar of tax than can be obtained by other types of tax. The graduated taxes are collected chiefly in the rich areas where the resources available to local taxation are ample for the support of schools. By federal appropriation the moneys thus raised can be transferred to the areas of need for the improvement of school systems that are now most inadequate.

Individual states in most cases cannot provide adequate funds for equalization purposes. Only federal action can provide equalization funds for interstate application. Within states, the ability of any particular state to provide funds for local equalization purposes is largely determined by whether its boundaries happen to include the industrial and commercial centers to which most of its area may be tributary. There are also definite limits to the extent to which any individual state can use taxes based upon ability to pay. These are the taxes above all others that should be used to provide funds for equalization purposes, and they can be applied effectively on a large scale only by the federal government.

The necessities of the people require the federal government to assume increasing responsibilities for the education and welfare of children, youth, and adults. By providing services of information, research, and national leadership, it must assist the states and local communities to obtain larger values from expenditures of their own resources. To some extent it must engage in the direct operation of mixed welfare and educational enterprises, such as the civilian conservation corps. Finally, the federal government must to an

increasing extent provide financial assistance for the educational enterprises of the states and localities, in order that opportunities may be greater and especially in order that they may be more equitably distributed.

When the necessity of financial assistance by the federal government is admitted, the question arises as to the extent to which there must be some degree of federal supervision over the expenditure of the funds. Fear of centralized control is unquestionably one of the major obstacles now standing in the way of further federal assistance to education. For although the American people are willing to have national action to relieve local distress, for sound reasons they are unwilling to accept federal directions over the local operation of the school system.

Local controls in government, and especially in education, have values that we should do our utmost to retain. If our school system were rigidly controlled from the state capitols or from Washington, it might become more efficient and its behavior would be more predictable, but it could no longer serve to give flexibility to the social order as a whole. Suitable adaptation to local needs would be difficult.

Despite its obvious inefficiencies and limitations, local freedom helps to assure experimentation, healthy rivalry between localities, popular interest in public questions, and that diversity of form and method which tends to prevent sudden disruption of the social order. Local school administrators selected by local representatives of the people should therefore be given as much independence by state and federal governments is as compatible with an acceptable standard of honesty and activity.

There are those who argue that the federal government should provide further financial assistance to education, and that it can and should do so without exerting any supervision whatsoever over the expenditure of the funds it provides. There are others who argue that aid without control is impossible, and that therefore no aid should be granted, notwithstanding the obvious fact that only through federal assistance can enough support be provided to permit suitable educational opportunities for some millions of American children.

The committee is of the opinion that both of these views contain some measure of truth, but that neither is wholly correct. Some federal aid must be provided, and there must be a limited amount of control, directed primarily at honesty, legality, and efficiency in the expenditure of federal funds. It is evident, however, that the American people would rightly object to any attempt to use federal aid as a means of controlling the content or processes of education in the schools. Although the federal government must meet its responsibility to the taxpayers for the proper expenditure of public funds, and some safeguards are therefore necessary, all necessary safeguards of this type can be provided without bringing the federal government into the local managment of schools.

The committee has attempted to formulate the principles that should be regarded as controlling in all federal legislation providing grants to the states for educational purposes. These principles may be stated as follows:

1. The major portion of all federal aid for education should be granted as a general fund for the current support of elementary and secondary education. In order that the states and local school jurisdictions may have the necessary flexibility in the development of programs suited to local conditions, the specification of particular phases of elementary and secondary education to be supported from such a fund should be avoided.

2. The major portion of federal aid for education should at all times be granted on a basis that tends to lessen inequalities of opportunity among states and within states.

3. Federal grants for special educational purposes may properly be used to bring about attention to educational matters of special national concern and thus to improve the educational programs conducted under state and local auspices, but such grants should be considered with very great care to see that improvement does in fact result. The states are the units for the organization of educational programs; the methods of making grants should therefore avoid so far as possible the overdevelopment of any one phase of a state program at the expense of other phases.

4. The federal government should record its purposes explicitly but broadly, leaving the states wide discretion and flexibility in the administration of the federal grants, although those grants should be conditioned upon distribution within states in conformity with the general purposes for which the grants are made.

5. The general principle of cooperation between the federal government and the states, without coercion by either party, should dominate legislation providing for federal grants; but wherever the major purpose of the grants is to bring about progress toward equality of educational opportunity, matching of funds by the states or local communities should not be required. Help is not needed in those areas where matching would be unjust if not impossible.

6. In order that local initiative and responsibility may be maintained, all federal action should reserve explicitly to state and local auspices the general administration of schools, control over the processes of education, and the determination of the best uses of the allotments of federal funds within the types of expenditure for which federal funds may be made available. The federal government should in no case attempt to control the curriculum of the schools or the methods of teaching to be employed in them. In those fields, however, it should carry on research and make the results widely available.

7. All federal grants for educational purposes to states maintaining separate schools and institutions for negroes should be conditioned upon an equitable distribution of the federal funds between facilities for the two races.

8. Federal grants should be used to build up and strengthen existing educational agencies and institutions insofar as they are able to serve important needs, and not to establish competing agencies and institutions.

9. Any system of federal grants as a whole should be consistent with sound fiscal policy and should facilitate progress in tax reform.

10. In view of the extent of existing federal relationships to state and

local conduct of education and their probable increase through the years, federal relations to education should be reviewed under specially constituted and appropriate auspices at intervals of not more than 10 years.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(Excerpts from an article by George F. Zook in School and Society, volume 40, pages 41-48, July 14, 1934.)

Our present difficulties in the support of education go back to our fundamental law. The federal constitution did not of course confer upon the central government authority to deal with education. Hence this responsibility was reserved to the several states. They in turn abdicated this obligation to the local units within the states.

For years local communities also shirked the responsibility for the maintenance of schools. Then arose a great line of prophets from Horace Mann to P. P. Claxton, who went about the states of this union preaching the inalienable right of little children to cultural heritage of the ages and the necessity of universal public education as the basis for popular government. Spreading the gospel of education was engaged in with a zeal akin to religious evangelism, of which it was indeed often an integral part. The spread of free schools into every corner of our land during the last 100 years not by governmental coercion but mainly through popular desire is one of the striking accomplishments of the marvelous age through which we have passed. The school units of those early days were no larger than those which could be attended conveniently by a group of children walking to school and which contained enough real estate to support the school through taxation. There was never even in the beginning any relationship between the number of children to be schooled and the ability of the community to support the schools.

The economic and social changes of recent decades, while they have generally raised the level of educational opportunity, have on the other hand also increased the inequalities of such opportunities between and among children. The concentration of wealth makes a high school education an easy possibility in some communities, in others junior college education is within easy reach, in still others various curricula leading to baccalaureate degrees may be obtained as against a limitation of school opportunities to the elementary grades in the case of a large proportion of children and young people not so fortunately situated.

One of the factors in this situation is the way in which the schools have been confined to the real estate property tax as almost their sole means of support. In the face of rapid increases in other types of wealth from which income was available the schools kept on levying local taxes on real estate while other public agencies, especially those carried on by the states, have been wise enough to use more modern and effective sources of taxation. In 1931-32, 80.5 per cent of revenue receipts from taxation and appropriation from the schools came from county and local sources. Practically all this came from taxes on real estate. On the other hand, the gasoline tax generally used for the maintenance of roads is an eloquent example of the kind of a

tax which can be levied successfully long after local property taxes have in many parts of the country all but broken down. While we can of course look forward confidently to the continued revival of business and industry in such a manner as to make it possible for the owners of property again to pay taxes in larger amounts than at present, I am confident that local taxes on property can never again be counted on as much as in the past to bear the burdens of interest and sinking fund for capital outlay and for general maintenance for the schools. If this statement is true we are indeed faced not with a theory but a condition that may well make those who have the welfare of our country through education at heart pause for extended consideration. We shall have to do something about it or the financial support of our educational program will be permanently impaired.

Inasmuch as I have just stepped out of federal service it is perhaps natural that I should share with you some of my observations relative to the problem of federal aid to education which have grown in part out of the brief but most interesting year during which it has been my privilege to serve as commissioner of education.

There are a number of considerations which bear upon this problem, but I call your attention to but two of them. First, the title to the wealth of the country which is produced by all of us working together in all parts of the country is concentrated in certain states and even in metropolitan areas of these states in a most interesting and surprising manner. It seems no more than simple justice, therefore, that a way should be found by means of which wealth may be taxed where it is located and the income thereform distributed to the states to be used for the education of the children where they are located.

In 1913 the sixteenth amendment to the federal constitution was adopted. This amendment authorized the federal government to levy income taxes on individuals. It is doubtful whether any addition to our fundamental law of greater social significance has been made since the beginnings of our government. This amendment conferred upon the federal government power to levy and collect the most important modern form of taxation. To a considerable extent the same kind of development has taken place relative to inheritance taxes and relative to certain sales taxes, notably on liquor, tobacco, and gasoline, which otherwise could have been used more extensively by the states to support state and local functions.

Our experience shows clearly that the federal government is far more effective in the collection of such taxes than the several states can possibly be. Moreover, through the services conducted by the federal government with the income derived from these sources all the people benefit, whereas a return of these several forms of taxation to the states would only emphasize the present injustices and inequalities between and among our citizens resulting from the concentration of the title to wealth in a small number of metropolitan areas. It is evident that this is not the solution of the financial problems facing the states and localities, including the schools.

I am convinced that if the federal government continues to levy these more modern forms of taxation, as it alone can do most effectively, it follows as

clearly as can be that some proportion of the proceeds of these taxes should be returned to the states for the support of state and local governmental functions, including schools.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call your attention to the fact that while I am here taking a stand in favor of federal aid to education I believe that we educators should be broadminded enough to recognize that whatever financial problems face schools also face all other aspects of our state and especially our local governments. Many people have objected violently that certain forms of education, namely, extension education in agriculture and home economics, vocational education and education in agriculture and mechanic arts to the neglect of others have been selected by the federal government for special subsidy. Whatever validity there is to these objections holds equally well for the whole of education as against all other state and local needs. To the extent, therefore, that we succeed in securing federal aid for education only there will always be a corresponding tendency for the states and localities to reduce their appropriations for this service. We cannot, therefore, and we ought not to want to escape the necessary close relationships which exist between the financial problems facing the schools and all other forms of local and state efforts. Would it not be wiser public policy, therefore, for us to join cordially in all efforts which may be made in Washington in the future to secure a comprehensive program of federal aid to the states and localities for all aspects of government, including the schools, rather than to pursue our own special needs too far? I believe that we ought to give this matter our earnest consideration. It would, among other things, avoid many of the problems of federal control of education.

Such a view may be too utopian for the present time. In other words, the schools are in such a difficult position that we must of course seize every opportunity to plead their cause. The federal government can and should do two things—it can build the schoolhouses of the country and it can help to maintain the schools.

From the amount of time which I have devoted to the problem of federal aid to education you would perhaps be justified in assuming that I think that federal aid is the most important problem of finances which is facing us. I do not hold this opinion. According to the fundamental law of the land, education is a responsibility of the several states.

The real challenge to the development of education, therefore, lies back home in our several states. It is in the state legislatures where the greatest battles must be fought. They will be battles requiring the vision to effect a thorough reorganization of small school districts into larger, more effective and more economical units. They will be battles to compel the state legislature to find new forms of modern taxes which can be collected by the state and distributed to the communities on some equitable basis, thus relieving the local property tax. They will be battles requiring the active interest of laymen and professional educators alike. It is indeed a tax for all of us. The situation is imminent, we must be up and at our work.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(An article by Frank P. Graham in the High School Journal, volume 21, pages 257-259, November, 1938.)

Federal aid to education became a historic part of the American system before even the adoption of the constitution, has been continued in a long succession of congressional grants to the states for agricultural, vocational, and higher education, and will be a further fulfillment of the great American tradition of federal aid to the states for roads, agriculture, health, research, higher education, and social security. Failure to provide federal aid now for the elementary and secondary schools is a failure of the American system to follow through for the most basic of all our American institutions. It is a failure to carry forward the democratic idea of more equal educational opportunity for all American children. Equal educational opportunity of the children who are to be citizens of both the states and the nation is the main responsibility of our constitutional republic of states and people.

The main support of public education will continue to be by the states and localities. It is proposed merely to supplement the two billion dollars now provided by the states and localities with federal appropriations which, in the sixth year for all purposes, will total 199 million dollars. Of this amount six millions will be for teacher education in a country in which one-fourth of the teachers have not gone beyond the high school. Six millions will be for rural libraries in view of the fact that of the 45 million people without local access to public libraries, 39½ million of them live in rural areas. Fifteen millions will be for adult education in a nation of 75 million adults, 26 million of whom did not get beyond the eighth grade, 15 million, of whom it is estimated, cannot read intelligently the daily newspaper, and more than 3 million of whom cannot read at all. The conception of adult education has advanced from an exclusive concern with the immigrant, the unskilled, the underschooled, and the underprivileged to a concern for continuous and universal voluntary education of all adults.

Most important of all, 140 millions in the sixth year are proposed for the elementary and secondary schools. The approximately 300 million dollars provided annually now for the less than 300,000 young men in the economically productive and socially desirable civilian conservation corps emphasize the far-reaching value of the modest 140 million dollars proposed as federal aid to the states for the more than 26,300,000 children in the public schools.

The terms of the control of public education will continue to be in the hands of the states and localities. Provision for local and state control is expressly written in the federal bill with the freedom and autonomy of the localities and states preserved as now in the selection of teachers and curriculum, the management of textbooks, school buses, health service, and the entire administration of the schools.

The two main principles for the distribution of the federal funds will be equitable distribution between the races and democratic distribution among the states according to the economic ability of the states and the number of children per adult population. The following facts established by committee

studies which make the basis for this principle will burn themselves into our American democratic consciousness and move the people to action.

In 1930 the farm people in the United States obtained 9 per cent of the nation's income and yet supported 31 per cent of the nation's children. Southeastern farm people with approximately 4,250,000 children received 2 per cent of the national income while northeastern non-farm people with approximately 8,500,000 children received 42 per cent of the national income. In three states less than $30 per child was invested in public education, while in three states more than $120 per child was invested. A higher tax rate is required to provide the $30 per child in three states than is required to provide the $120 per child in the three other states. In the states of the least economic ability the people pay the highest tax rate for the education of their children on the lowest plane in the nation.

An economic, social, cultural lag in any part of the country is an economic, social, and cultural damage to all parts of the country. Forty per cent of the young people ten to twenty years old on farms in 1920 were in cities at the end of the decade. Sixty per cent of this net migration was from southern rural areas. While some regions are failing to reproduce their own population the south has a 30 per cent excess of births over deaths. The region with less than a third of the population has more than 50 per cent of the excess of births over deaths in the nation. A large proportion of the children who in their non-productive years are supported and educated by rural people become in their economically creative years the producers in the vital industries and the citizens of the urban communities. The quality of the education in these rural areas is a matter of vital concern to the industries, the cities, and the people of the whole country. Economic inability and educational overload coincide in the same rural and sectional areas to fix educational inequality and to impair the foundations of our national democracy. Just as within the states children in rural localities can have a fairer educational opportunity only through state aid to the localities so children in the rural states can have a more equal educational opportunity only through federal aid to the states. Over half of the American states are rural states.

Our corporate business structure while drawing on the rural states, on all elements of the population, all sections of the country, and all the resources of the nation, concentrates the greatest wealth in the metropolitan areas with the least number of children per adult population. Much of the low valued raw source of this wealth is in the areas where are the greatest proportion of children. These natural resources, these raw materials, the work of the people in these tributary areas contribute greatly to wealth at its levels of highest valuations and its centers of greatest concentration where are the least proportion of children. The federal government is the only agency which can redress this economic and educational imbalance between the metropolitan areas of the greatest concentration of wealth and the rural areas of the greatest concentration of children per adult population. Three-fourths of the cost of public education is carried by taxation of property, chiefly local. For the most part taxation of agricultural property is taxation of the people on

the farms where the tax is imposed. It cannot readily be shifted. Taxation of financial and industrial wealth, to an increasing extent in our integrated national industrial systems, is shifted to the consumers of the whole nation. Since all sections, all resources, and all the people combine to produce the wealth concentrated in the great centers and since all the people as consumers help pay the taxes on this wealth, it is just that a little bit of the income from this wealth as federal aid to public education should go back to the states whence it came and where are now the largest proportion of children whose equality and quality of education determine the future of democracy in America.

With democracy in retreat in many parts of the world may America give a lift to the democratic hopes of the forgotten millions in all parts of the world with a new declaration for equitable and democratic federal aid to public education under state control in the American way for the fairer chance and more equal opportunity of all the children in all the states.

THE FINANCING OF THE PROGRAM OF EDUCATION

(Excerpts from an address by George D. Strayer at the Institute of Education, held at Chapel Hill, N. C., June 29, 1934.)

Much of the legislation concerning the financing of education during the past three years has had for its purpose the restriction of expenditures. It is easy to understand the pressure brought to bear upon legislative bodies to limit taxation. Many well-meaning citizens are misled by an argument which proposes that education can be maintained at a reasonable level of efficiency even though expenditures are greatly reduced. This point of view fails to recognize the fact that the load which the schools have to carry has increased with the deepening depression.

The challenge presented to public education was never before so great. Much of the legislation which we have had is destructive. The time has come to face the issue and to demand legislation which will make possible a better service through the public schools.

Our schools must be kept open. We may not rest satisfied in a situation in which school terms are being reduced. Schools must reach every child in every state. At a time when government is accepting increased responsibility for every aspect of life, schools, the only institute set aside for the preparation of boys and girls and men and women for their responsibilities as citizens, must be maintained at a high level of efficiency.

There will be little dissent from the proposal that schools should be maintained and that their programs should be developed to meet the needs of the hour.

But while we are seeking to secure legislation by the Congress which will provide federal support for education, we should insist that this support be granted without federal interference with the organization, administration and supervision of education by the several states. That this result is one that we have a right to demand is indicated in the early history of federal

support. From 1785 down to 1862 grants of land and of money by the federal government were made to the states without any attempt by the federal government to supervise or control education. The principles of state and local autonomy were fully recognized. Beginning with the first Morrill act in 1862, the federal government entered upon a new policy. Support was made available for a particular type of education—in this first case, for colleges of agricultural and mechanic arts. More recent federal legislation has included not only a designation of the particular division of the school system to be supported but also provisions for review and approval of the curricula offered. This latter policy is contrary to our fundamental law and to our accepted practice of state and local autonomy in education.

The current emergency offers an opportunity to return to the earlier practices with respect to federal aid. It is neither necessary nor desirable that any federal agency should enter to control the expenditure of money made available to the several states. All that can legitimately be required is an audit that will establish the fact that the money granted by the federal government has been used for the purpose for which it was appropriated.

The principles already developed and found valid in the support of education within the state should be applied in the case of federal support. The purpose to be realized is the guarantee of a fundamental program of education to children throughout the nation. Money should be distributed upon an objective basis, taking account of the need for support and of the ability residing in each of the states. The techniques necessary for the enactment of legislation based on these principles have been outlined by Dr. Paul R. Mort, the director of the National Survey of School Finance, and are embodied in proposed legislation now before the Congress.

There can be no doubt concerning the necessity for federal action. The United States is in ever-increasing measure becoming one great economic unit. Business and industry are organized on a national rather than upon a local basis. The wealth available for taxation is seven times as great in the wealthiest state as it is in the poorest state. In like manner, if one inquires concerning the amount of income available in relation to the number of children to be educated, he finds that the amount available per child is more than four times as much in the wealthiest state as in the poorest. These discrepancies in ability are clearly indicated by the fact that in one state the average expenditure for education amounts to $192 per child annually; while in another state the average expenditure for this purpose drops to $55 per child. Federal responsibility, however, does not rest wholly upon these variations in the ability of the several states to provide support for the educational programs. We live in an interdependent society. Our population is mobile. Boys and girls born and educated in one state move to other states as they reach adult life. We have even had large migrations of people from one section of the country to another. It is apparent that the well being of every section of the country is dependent upon the provision for education made in each of the several states. Ignorance cannot be segregated in the United States.

The response of the American people to the need for further national sup-

port will be dependent upon their realization of the great national purpose that is served by our schools and in their willingness to sacrifice for the sake of a great ideal. We may not hope for the perpetuation of our representative democracy and of the freedom which we enjoy except upon the basis provided in the education of all of the children of all the people. The only time that the children of this generation may enjoy educational opportunity is now. We may postpone the building of roads or the construction of public buildings, but we cannot postpone the education of our children. A denial of educational opportunity now cannot but result in disaster in the years which lie ahead.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

(Excerpts from the pamphlet, "Federal Aid for Education," published in 1942 by the National Education Association.)

About 1869 the National Teachers' Association—forerunner of the National Education Association—became actively interested in the proposal for a national university at Washington. In 1872 a bill was introduced in Congress to establish such a university but neither this bill nor any of its successors was passed.

In 1919 a committee of the association recommended the establishment of a federal department of education with a secretary in the President's cabinet and the appropriation of $100,000,000 each year to the states for the improvement of schools generally. Bills containing these provisions were introduced in 1919 (Smith-Towner), in 1921 (Sterling-Towner), and in 1923 (Sterling-Reed), but none was enacted. A few years later a similar bill without the provision for federal aid was advocated without success.

In 1936 the National Education Association sponsored the Harrison-Black-Fletcher bill, which provided for an initial appropriation of $100,000,000 to the states for schools and an increase of $50,000,000 each year until $300,000,000 per year would have been reached. After hearings before the appropriate committee of Congress, the bill was approved by the senate committee but got no further.

In 1931 the National Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Hoover, issued a report presenting the facts, principles and policies which it believed should determine federal relations to education in the states. The report proposed no definite plan of federal aid but recommended that all future grants to the states be made for education in general rather than for specific phases of education.

In 1936 President Roosevelt appointed a committee on vocational education to study the experience of the states under the existing program of federal aid for vocational education. In 1937 this committee's name was changed to the "Advisory Committee on Education" and it was asked to consider all aspects of the relationship between the federal government and the state and local conduct of education. The committee presented its report in 1938 with the following recommendations:

"1. General federal aid to the states for elementary and secondary education should begin with $40,000,000 per year and should be increased annually to $140,000,000 the sixth year. These grants should be allocated by formula according to the number of school-age children and the financial ability of the states. Each state should plan jointly with the U. S. Office of Education so as to lessen most effectively the inequalities of educational opportunity within the state. State and local agencies should continue to administer the schools, determine the content and processes of education, and decide how federal funds shall be used within the types of expenditure permitted. The U. S. Office of Education should audit the federal fund accounts of each state and should suspend payments to any state which fails to maintain an adequate administrative agency or fails to make required reports promptly.

"2. Special federal funds should be established to assist the states in (a) improving the preparation of teachers, (b) constructing public school buildings, (c) administering state departments of education, (d) providing educational services for adults, (e) extending library service to rural areas, and (f) carrying on educational research, demonstrations, and planning."

Following the publication of the advisory committee's report, the National Education Association through its legislative commission took the initiative in drafting a new federal aid bill based on the recommendations in that report. This bill, known as the Harrison-Thomas-Fletcher bill, died on the calendar of the senate and in the house committee on education. It was succeeded in 1939 by a new bill (S. 1305) which, although based on the advisory committee's report, was designed to meet certain objections to the earlier measure. Like its predecessor, S. 1305, it was reported favorably by the senate committee on education and labor but failed to become a law.

By 1941 changing circumstances had made it desirable to reconsider the whole question of federal aid for education in the states. Accordingly, a new bill was drafted under NEA sponsorship to meet the following needs: (1) school facilities for children recently removed to areas of defense activities and industries; (2) better financial support of education for negroes in states maintaining separate schools for negroes; (3) equalization of opportunities for general elementary and secondary education among and within the states; (4) school facilities for children of migratory workers other than those in defense activities; and (5) suitable education for children of federal employes residing on government properties or reservations. The new measure, known as S. 1313, differed from its immediate predecessors in two important respects. It authorized a general appropriation of $300,000,000 each year without earmarking except for limitations on the amounts available for certain purposes, including school facilities needed solely to meet the exigencies of national defense. The bill also provided for a board of apportionment to determine the educational needs and financial abilities of the states and to make such allotments of federal funds as would equalize educational opportunities most effectively.

S. 1313 was introduced by Senators Thomas of Utah and Harrison of Mississippi in April, 1941. It was given a three-day hearing by the senate

committee on education and labor but no further action was taken. Early in 1942 a modified draft of the bill was introduced under the sponsorship of Senator Thomas and Senator Hill (Alabama). This draft, known as S. 1313 (Amended), provides (1) that the proposed fund of $300,000,000 be distributed for the equalization of educational opportunities in elementary and secondary schools without reference to special phases of the problem; (2) that the money be allotted by the U. S. Commissioner of Education instead of by a special board; (3) that all but $5,000,000 of the fund be distributed among the states and territories according to a simple formula specified in the bill; and (4) that the money be used only for educational agencies and institutions under public control. S. 1313 (Amended) has the official support of the National Education Association and a number of other important national organizations.

STATEMENT OF PAUL V. McNUTT

(Excerpts from statement of P. V. McNutt, as carried in Hearings on S. 1313 before a sub-committee of the U. S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor, April 28, 1941.)

I have long advocated that the federal government must cooperate with the states in the financing of public elementary and secondary schools to the extent necessary to make possible a reasonable and defensible program of educational opportunity throughout the nation.

There is ample evidence that the only practical way educational opportunities can be equalized among and within the several states is through a program of federal state cooperation. The states have of necessity long ago recognized that marked differences exist in the ability of their various communities to support an adequate educational program. The federal government must recognize the marked differences in the ability of the various states. The equalization of these differences on the state level has been assumed by the states to the extent of their several abilities. But the states, just as communities in states, differ greatly in financial ability. On a national level, the equalization of educational opportunities must rest on the federal government. There is a vital and proper national interest in the equalization of educational opportunities among the states.

This problem of equalization can and will be solved without impairment of state control of the scope and content of the educational program by grants to those states in greatest need of financial assistance. The fiscal and administrative aspects of the problem are no longer conjectural. These aspects have been fully investigated by the President's advisory committee on education, the unchallenged findings of which I understand will be presented to you by Dr. Reeves, chairman of that committee.

The conclusions on which this legislation is based were uniformly reached. From 1921 down to the present time from a long series of very serious and competent efforts, the financial conditions back of the support of public education in this country have been ascertained. This included studies by the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, 1921-25; the National

Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Hoover, 1929-31; the national survey of school finance, carried on first by the United States Office of Education and later completed by the American Council on Education, 1932-35; the Advisory Committee on Education, appointed by President Roosevelt, 1937-38; the American youth commission, 1935-41.

The progress of American education is inextricably interwoven with federal aid. From the earliest days of the republic the federal government has made financial contributions, directly or indirectly, to the states for the establishment and maintenance of public educational institutions on all levels. From the Revolution to the Civil War, the federal government endowed higher and common schools with lands and made grants of surplus tax moneys. Following the Civil War land grants to new states were continued and the policy of direct money grants begun.

The Morrill-Nelson act (1862 and 1890), appropriating funds for land-grant colleges and universities; the Hatch act (1887), appropriating money for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations in connection with land-grant colleges; the Smith-Lever act (1914) and Capper-Ketcham act (1928), providing for agricultural extension work through land-grant colleges; and the Smith- Hughes act (1917) and subsequent similar acts for vocational education in agriculture, trades, and industries, home economics and distributive occupations all illustrate a fundamental interest of the federal government in the fostering of public education.

Thus the precedents were established and none of the dire predictions of those who have traditionally opposed federal aid for education on the ground that it would result in federal control of education have materialized. These arguments are as outworn as those directed against the public schools themselves. The experience of the 69 land-grant colleges sharply distinguishes federal-state cooperation in educational matters from federal domination of state educational policies.

The last Congress extended the field of cooperation. Necessary defense training programs are being at present federally financed, and given through state schools. Opportunities for this vocational training, however, are closed to thousands of American youth who live in some communities where there are no high schools, and to many other American youths because they have had insufficient elementary school training to enable them to participate in these programs. Today's defense training efforts have been successful largely because of state vocational schools, and in our elementary schools we must lay the foundation for the youth and adults who will be needed in the nation's economic life tomorrow. When, because of lack of educational opportunity, an individual's native capacity is undeveloped, not only is the individual grossly wronged by society, but the whole nation is the loser.

There is no doubt that a reasonable amount of federal financial assistance to equalize educational opportunities among the states would rapidly result in a vast improvement in the quality and quantity of education now offered to several million American children and youth.

Having mentioned precedents for the proposed legislation, I should like

to point to some of the needs it would meet. Emphasis in the pending bill, S. 1313, is placed on equalizing educational opportunities for youth in rural areas. In many rural areas free public high school advantages are wholly lacking. In several states, largely rural, a relatively large proportion of the youth of high school age have no high school advantages. In seven states less than 15 per cent of the total public school enrollment is in high school as contrasted with 24 per cent or more in seven other states.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL AID

Below are excerpts from the report of the committee on federal aid of the Southern States Work-Conference, which was presented by Jule B. Warren, chairman, at the summer conference of the North Carolina Education Association, held at Durham on June 19, 1942:

The inevitable, inescapable and logical conclusion of every study of educational conditions in these fourteen southern states is that the only ultimate solution of the educational problem here is federal aid as proposed in the substitute for senate bill 1313. It is not necessary to reiterate here the arguments for federal aid, but merely to point out the additional implications there are for federal aid in the war effort of the nation. If every southern state had a model taxing system and used all the resources at its command, and tapped all the sources indicated in table III of this report, we would not have sufficient revenues to provide southern children an educational opportunity that would equal the average in the nation. As this report has indicated from beginning to end this situation has been aggravated, and intensified by the war effort increasing the burden on the schools and depleting their sources of revenue.

Lack of revenue, which has caused short school terms, poorly paid, and sometimes poorly trained, teachers, poor building facilities, and narrow curriculum offerings in these fourteen southern states has been an important factor in the south's low rating in the percentage of school population in high schools. Had this need for national equalization of education been put into effect a decade ago, the present wail of army officers about the failure of selectees to meet the educational test necessary for a mechanized warfare would not have been uttered, and the search of the aviation forces for high school graduates for training as pilots would not have been in vain.

It is too late, of course, to engage in wishful thinking over the southern boys who could have served the nation better had the nation helped educate this great reservoir of human resources in the south, or over the high school graduates who cannot meet the educational test for training as aviators. It is not too late, however, for the federal government to help meet one of the crying needs for the expansion of the high school curriculum so that more boys and girls can be taught some of the mechanized skills and mathematics courses, which the armed forces are calling vainly for the high schools to stress. It is not too late to recognize that there is a direct relationship between high standards of instruction and financial ability to pay for the kind of teachers each parent covets for his own child. It is not

too late, even now, for the federal government to rectify a 75 year old mistake of failing to equalize educational opportunity.

Although it took an insidious attack by forces, believing in the medieval doctrine that might makes right, to reveal that armed ignorance is no fit foe against a cunning and trained enemy, it is not too late for Congress to meet this situation now by helping train at least one-half the nation's children, who without education, fight an unequal battle for all that America stands for.

Another factor which has entered the lists on the side of federal aid as a result of this war is the dangerous possibility that the wide differential in educational load and financial ability will be widened as the ultimate effect of the war. True it is that millions of dollars are being poured into the south for army camps, supply bases, shipyards, and other projects incident to the immediate prosecution of the war. All of these will be abandoned and the equipment sold as junk once the victory is won. The already heavily industrialized sections of the nation are being still further enriched with war orders and industrial equipment that will have permanent value after the war is over. The necessity for speed in the preparations for war made this inevitable. It is just as inevitable, however, that when the enemy capitulates we will face the long and difficult years of rebuilding peacetime institutions and activities with this imbalance still further accentuated. The probabilities are that the richer sections will be more able than ever to support a good school program, and the south will be less able than it was before the war.

The pessimists, who have thought the young generation was "going to the dogs," have seen a new light since the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. That treacherous act has increased the faith of those who had the utmost confidence in these young people all the time. Never have our boys and girls meant so much to the nation as they do now. We are not asking where they are from—it may be the north, the south, the east, or the west—but the great thing is that they are Americans. And, is there a person who claims to cherish all that our flag stands for, who would deny them an opportunity for equal basic minimum opportunities for education?

The only way the nation can show its appreciation for the part youth must play in preventing totalitarianism from engulfing democracy is to back a program for equalization of educational opportunity.

THE NATION'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION

(Excerpts from an article by Lister Hill in the Journal of the National Education Association, volume 30, page 165, September, 1941.)

We are today the only first-class nation in the world "living as free men and free women, able to worship at our own altars, speak our own faith, and walk erect." And yet in the days before the emergency with its great tempo of production, we had nine million men unemployed, walking the streets and tramping the highways searching for jobs.

We saw the squalor in the slums of our cities, the tumble-down shacks

in the cotton belt with its poverty and its exploitation, and the Joads roaming the wasted land of the west. Nearly half our 32,000,000 farm people lived in tenancy. We saw our rivers running red to the sea with the soil's rich blood while woodlands of millions of acres had been depleted.

We witnessed most appalling differences in educational opportunity among and within the states—differences due to no lack of effort on the part of the states but to economic conditions beyond the power of the states to control—differences in wealth, income, taxpaying ability, absentee ownership of resources and industries—differences in the number of children in proportion to adults.

Eight years ago, stunned and frightened by the depression, we awoke from a dream in which we had been chasing the rainbow of pseudo-prosperity and realized that we had passed into a new era; that we could no longer solve depression by shipping the unemployed west.

Men were hungry but the good earth that had fed mankind from the beginning was still here—needing only man's initiative, imagination, and energy to plan, plant, and reap.

We proclaimed the continuous responsibility of the government for human welfare. We set about to repair the damages of past generations. We launched a great program of conservation of forest and soil and water and human beings. We began to eliminate farm tenancy, to carry the blessings of electricity to the farm home, to give agriculture parity with industry.

We built countless schoolhouses. We multiplied manifold the funds for vocational education. With CCC and NYA we provided educational benefits for disadvantaged youths. We cleared slums, lifted mortgages, increased per capita income, and gave to the people a new hope.

But the youth of today must realize that the job has only begun. The great work with the elimination of its errors and its omissions must go on. With the homesteading of the last of the old frontier and with the marvelous development of the machine, the question is not how to compete with each other for enough of this world's goods but to learn how to live with each other in abundance. Youth must learn how to obey economic traffic lights and drive great social machines on the right-hand side of the road.

America's young men and women must write the future guarantees for economic freedom just as the writers of the Declaration of Independence and the authors of the constitution wrote the guarantees of the political liberties which they left as our heritage.

He must realize that the keynote of the new frontiers must be cooperation through the democratic process. He must think more in terms of social invention and less in terms of mechanical invention. He must open the doors that common men may enter into their inheritance. That the youth of today may do these things so necessary to the life of our country and to the maintenance of our free institutions, he must be given the best possible education.

Educational opportunities throughout the land must be equalized by raising all educational standards to the best. This can be done only

through the resources and power of the federal government. It is the solemn responsibility and the compelling duty of the federal government to do this. In the complex civilization in which we live, a nation cannot maintain its democratic way of life if its people are ignorant. And in this day of gigantic military machines in the air, on land, and on water, a nation is not safe unless economically strong, with its people educated in terms of literacy, of vocational skill, and of professional skill.

We enacted the selective service act to prepare our youth to serve the nation, if need be, in time of war. We should pass the federal aid for education bill as the handmaiden to that act to prepare our youth to serve the nation both in time of war and of peace.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

(An editorial in the High School Journal, volume 17, pages 43-45, February, 1934.)

Federal participation in the support of general public education is in the offing as one of the major enterprises of a planned national economy. The waste in human values inherent in the old district system of education was one of the principal reasons why in the march of human progress the district system had to give way to a larger unit of support and administration. Control passed from the district to the county, and as time went on the administration of first one and then another aspect of the educational enterprise passed to the state. In the course of time glaring inequalities of educational opportunity as between the counties of a given state became more pronounced, and in order to eliminate or reduce these inequalities, the state gradually assumed entire control of the major aspects of public education and participated to a larger degree in the support of schools. For many years now there has been a marked tendency in our thinking for the state to assume the entire burden of support (as happened in North Carolina) and to control and administer all essential aspects of public education. State expenses now for public education are regarded as an investment which the state makes in its own well-being, stability and perpetuity. Thus the state has become "conscious" of its responsibility and its obligations in the matter of providing for all its youth adequate educational opportunities.

While this has been going on there has also been a growing consciousness of a limited responsibility on the part of the federal government in the support of public education. Just as inequalities at first became more pronounced as between the districts of a county and later between the counties of a state, now inequality of opportunity as between the states has actually become a matter of national concern. State lines in most matters of major importance in the common life of the nation have all but been obliterated, and will never again, perhaps, mean what they once meant under a *laissez-faire* economy. Since the passage of the first Morrill act of 1862 the federal government has assumed responsibility for one aspect or another of our educational enterprise and has appropriated large sums

of money for the promotion and the support of special phases of our total educational program until it now carries on so many and so diverse educational functions that a federal commission studying this matter some two or three years ago was not sure, after diligent and prolonged study, that it had actually listed all of the educational enterprises in which the federal government participates. Already public education in the United States, although still regarded as a function of the state theoretically, is national in its conception, national in its outlook, and national in its obligations. It is now a "constructive national tool" in the words of Elwood P. Cubberly, and "an instrument of the first importance in molding and shaping the destinies of the people." To quote Cubberly further, it is "the greatest of all undertakings for the promotion of the national welfare."

When President Roosevelt inaugurated the New Deal the simple formula which he followed was to take both the idle capital and the idle labor of the nation and put them to work under a planned national economy. The extent to which the federal government has set up codes for the control of production, money and banking, industry and the rest, is evidence sufficient that we are in the midst of one of the greatest revolutions civilized man has known. Just what the new social order that is emerging is to be like no one is quite sure. It looks as though rugged individualism and the capitalistic regime will have to go, or at least be controlled in the interest of the common good. The economic system will continue to have its place but it will occupy a role secondary to that of social well-being. It will be controlled to human ends and on a national scale. A few years of such control, and America will not likely again exalt it to a place of dominance in the national life. All of which means inevitably that the federal government is going to be forced to use education as a national tool and to participate in the support of general education, not limiting its participation to specialized phases of education as hitherto. If the control and support of public education should be left wholly to the separate states, it is seriously to be doubted whether the states single-handed and each for itself alone will be able to combat successfully the organized forces behind the nation-wide propaganda against decent expenditures for schools. These forces have been operating on a national scale in opposition to schools since 1923. Many state legislatures, particularly in the backward states, certainly have not been able to cope successfully with them in recent years, and it is seriously to be doubted whether any state single-handed will be able to do so—to the extent of providing the educational opportunities for effective citizenship that the New Deal in all its implications makes mandatory. Greater opportunity for leisure, for creative living, and for cultural advancement under an intelligently planned social economy will greatly increase the demands upon the schools and will multiply their opportunities to the extent that education must inevitably become a concern of supreme national importance, the cost of which must be shared in larger measure by the federal government.

STATEMENT OF F. W. REEVES

(Excerpts from a statement of F. W. Reeves, as carried in Hearings on S. 1313 before a sub-committee of the U. S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor, April 28, 1941.)

In 1900 the ability of the richest state to support education was about ten times as great as the ability of the poorest state. In 1912 again it was ten times. In 1922 it dropped down to a ratio of 5 to 1, and then in 1934 it went up again to a ratio of 6 to 1. At no time during this entire period since 1900, at least during no year included in these samples, was there a ratio of less than 5 to 1. That is, the richest state always had 5 or more times as much ability to support education as the poorest state.

For the entire region of the United States we find also very great variation. For example, in 1934, taking all the New England states as a group, there was three and one-third times the ability to support education that the east-south-central states had, and two and one-third times the ability to support education that the south Atlantic states had.

In the report which I am going to file there is an exhibit which shows current expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance by states for the school years 1931-32, 1935-36, and 1937-38. For all three of these years New York spent the most per pupil. The expenditure per child in average daily attendance for New York was $152 in 1931-32; $134 in 1935-36; and $147 in 1937-38.

Considering these same three years, Arkansas in 1931-32 spent the least of any of the states. It spent $31 per pupil. In 1935-36 again we find Arkansas at the bottom with $24 per pupil, but in 1937-38 Mississippi falls at the bottom with $28 per pupil.

What I wish to point out is merely this, that in every one of these three years the expenditure per child in New York was more than five times as great as in the state having the lowest expenditure per child.

I was planning to comment on the need of facilities for the people who are moving into these communities, but I believe that has been adequately covered by Governor McNutt and Mr. Dawson, so I will pass that over, except to say that I am acquainted with the facts in the situation and am in complete agreement with their points of view on this matter.

Throughout the years since 1900 many of our city schools, in fact, most of our city schools, have improved their programs markedly. That is particularly true in the city schools in the wealthier states. Everywhere in the country we find the rural schools tend to be poorer than the city schools; and in those states where the ability to support education is low, there we find the rural schools are exceptionally poor. Buildings are mostly just shacks. Pupils have few, if any, books to work with. The teachers are poorly qualified. A very large number of the teachers in the rural schools in many of these states that have the low taxpaying ability have never gone beyond the high school in their own education, and on the whole they are very poorly paid. For example, in some states the average salary of teachers is less than one-fourth as high as it is in other states that have more ability to support education.

As was pointed out before, by and large, taking all the states as a group, the greatest effort is being made by those states which are spending the least for their schools, which have the poorest teachers, which have the poorest school facilities and the least equipment with which to work. The people make a very much greater effort in these states than they do in some of the wealthier states, but they get very much less for it, because their tax base is very much lower.

One major point that enters into this picture is the relationship of the number of children to adults. In some of these rural states we find the ratio of children to adults is very much greater than in certain other states, like California. In fact, for every 1,000 adults between the ages of 20 and 64 there are approximately twice as many children from 5 to 17 years of age in some states as in others. In the rural southeast in 1930—and by that I am including eleven states—the farm population included 13 per cent of the nation's children, but this farm population received only 2 per cent of the national income. Thirteen per cent of the children but only 2 per cent of the national income.

In contrast to this, in the non-farm area of the northeastern states, where there were almost exactly twice as many children as in the farm areas of the southeast, the income was 21 times as large.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS IS INEVITABLE

(An article by Fred Engelhardt in the Nation's Schools, volume 13, page 47, February, 1934. Reprinted by permission of the Nation's Schools and the author.)

An extensive study of economic trends in the United States and of the relationship between the states and the federal government indicates that federal aid to public schools is inevitable.

The evolution of public education within the several states brought with it a struggle between support and control. It was a long time before those who controlled the taxable resources were willing to admit that education is a state function. It also was some time before the states were ready to assume the responsibility of equalizing public school costs which constituted such a heavy burden on certain sections of each state. Some states do not yet appear to be aware of their responsibilities in this connection.

In the movement to bring about equality of educational opportunity to all children within the various states the local school districts gladly accepted as much money as the state was willing to give them so long as the state left the local division free to do as it pleased. State support appeared essential, but it was insisted that local control must be maintained.

State support without state control resulted in a new form of inequality. Many areas in each state gained distinct advantages over other areas, irrespective of the method used for distributing state money. The reason for this situation was that the underlying structure of the school district was unsound. Lacking control the state had no way of correcting the basic

diseased conditions fostered by the existing school district. Thus state support without state control tended to perpetuate conditions that were basically unsound—socially, economically and educationally.

Economic pressure has gradually forced advocates of this false interpretation of the theory of local autonomy to admit that control and support of public education within a state cannot be separated satisfactorily. Educational leaders must develop a balance between state support and control that will function in actual practice. The proper step in this direction will be taken when the most economical unit of school administration has been created and when those characteristics that are essential to the preservation of public enthusiasm for education are fostered. Time and study will eventually produce this situation.

The states are now passing through a similar evolution with respect to the place of federal government in educational matters. The day will come when those who control federal resources will be forced to admit that the federal government has certain responsibilities for the maintenance of public schools. The first step in acknowledging this responsibility is through federal support, and the states will accept the money granted with enthusiasm as long as control remains with the state.

It will require some time for the necessary readjustment in thinking to take place, the same as it did in the case of state support. It will be impossible to operate for any length of time on the theory that the federal government may grant money to states for educational purposes without federal control. Time and past experience will show that certain sections of the country will profit at the expense of other sections under such a plan. In other words, the people will ask: Why allow an area of the country to continue as a state when it cannot exist economically as a self-supporting unit? The doctrine of state rights will then be bitterly contested.

As the federal government assumes its responsibilities for public education it will be necessary to establish that balance between support and control which is essential to the maintenance of efficient and economical schools. It will be discovered that certain educational activities are best carried on by the federal government; that other activities are handled best by the state, and that still other activities are rightfully the responsibility of the local school divisions within the state. Is it mere speculation to imagine that there will be fewer than forty-eight states when the ideal plan of public education is eventually evolved?

FEDERAL AID AND THE TAX PROBLEM

(An article by Clarence Heer in the Education Digest, volume 4, page 35, May, 1939.)

The principal conclusions of the present survey of the fiscal aspects of federal aid for education may be briefly summarized.

1. From the point of view of all four of the major tests of a good tax system—fiscal adequacy, administrative efficiency, equity, and economic ef-

fects—federal aid for education offers a better method for raising new money for schools than state and local taxation.

2. From the point of view of fiscal adequacy, federal aid is superior because it places the responsibility for raising new school funds on the level of government which has the widest range of productive tax sources at its disposal and which is in the best position to exploit those sources effectively.

3. From the point of view of administrative efficiency, federal aid for education is to be preferred because it will permit the needed school revenue to be raised by methods which involve less annoyance and expense to the taxpayer, which present fewer opportunities for tax avoidance, and which entail relatively lower administrative costs.

4. From the point of view of equity, federal aid for education represents the most desirable alternative because it will place the responsibility for obtaining additional school revenue on the level of government best fitted to distribute its taxes according to the principle of ability to pay. To the extent that public education is a matter of national concern, federal aid will make it possible more nearly to equalize the burden of maintaining a national minimum of educational opportunity throughout the country. To the extent that education is a state and local function, federal aid will provide a means of correcting the inequities in the present system of school support which result from the extraterritorial shifting of state and local taxes.

5. Finally, from the point of view of economic effects, federal aid for education offers the better mode of procedure because the federal government has far greater freedom than have the states and localities to select fiscal measures appropriate to given economic and social objectives.

NEGATIVE REFERENCES

SAFEGUARDS OF FREEDOM IN A DEMOCRACY

(Excerpts from an article by Robert A. Taft in the American School Board Journal, volume 103, pages 20, 52, 54, August, 1941.)

The federal system is a safeguard of local self-government, and to my mind the right of local self-government is essential to freedom in a democracy as large as the United States. The personal freedom assured by the bill of rights is a negative freedom. It is not all the freedom that an American desires. He wishes to have something to say positively about the way his community is governed, and about the character of the officers whose action can affect his welfare. In a small town meeting he has an effective voice, but as the size of the electorate increases, his voice becomes smaller and smaller; his freedom to act and to have a voice in government grows constantly less. In the city of Cincinnati, I remember, those who were displeased with government action could appear before council, and they could obtain consideration for their opinions. Their votes would have a sufficient weight in the coming election to insure a respectful consideration. But I wish you could see a group of petitioners from Ohio wandering through the marble corridors of the magnificent office buildings in Washington. They are lucky if in three days they can find the man who has the discretion to recommend to someone else the action which they desire to have taken. And then they get the kind of formally polite treatment which bureaucracies have handed out for centuries in all countries of the world.

The result is that groups of people have to band together and employ other men to represent their interests in Washington. Of course such employes are always concerned with government subsidies or other assistance to special groups of citizens. They have to earn their salaries by securing financial advantage, but the interests of the average individual citizen get no real consideration. Minority groups and blocs are looking for privileges rather than freedom.

The truth is that government from a distant capital is always likely to be tyranny. In a country as big as the United States today, no man sitting in Washington can make regulations which will fit all the five thousand counties from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He can't know enough about conditions to make them fit, and that kind of regulation, when applied to a community which does not want it, deprives that community of freedom. Of course the planners and the people who think they know all about industry and government and sociology, and even the people who think they know all about education, would like to impose their ideas upon the entire country. It would make a much neater pattern.

But it would deprive many communities of the freedom to have the kind of government they want. Under a truly democratic system of local self-government, on all subjects predominantly local the planners have to sell their ideas to every community in the United States. It is much harder work. Progress will be much slower. But in the end it will be made on a

much sounder foundation. The pattern will never be uniform. There will always be communities adhering to outworn practices, but there will be other communities experimenting and moving ahead of the methods and philosophy which happen to be in style at the moment. After all, freedom implies that the people have the right to govern themselves badly if they wish to do so. Our faith in freedom is such that we are convinced that the average efficiency of government is infinitely greater where governments are free.

Of course we must recognize that many matters have acquired a national interest and can only be regulated from Washington. But the federal government has gone far today in attempting to control matters which are of primary interest to the local communities. There are many men in Washington today who believe in a complete abolition of the states and a direct control by Washington of local governments. I believe that would mean the abolition of one of the greatest of all our safeguards of freedom. Without the right of the individual communities to exercise final power on those affairs which are primarily of local interest, we would destroy half of the freedom which our people enjoy today, and find ourselves far on the road to totalitarian government.

The danger of a centralized government is greater in no field than in that of education. We have had pending in Congress for several years, approved at one time, I believe, by the National Education Association, a general education bill, providing an elaborate plan of federal subsidies to primary and secondary school education. It recognizes in theory the wisdom of leaving the control of education in the states, but I believe the inevitable effect of the bill will be a federal control of primary education. This year's bill is somewhat general, leaving a wide discretion, but that discretion could and would probably be exercised as expressly provided for in the 1939 bill. For instance, federal funds could only be used for certain kinds of health, welfare, and recreational activities, and the federal bureau of education could practically say what they must be. Every state was required to establish standards for the location and construction of school buildings, and before paying out any money, the federal bureau was going to have to determine whether real standards had been established. The bill required each state to establish a state educational authority to represent the state in dealings with the commissioner of education. The federal government was going to determine in each state whether the federal money was properly distributed between schools for the white race and schools for the colored race. The commissioner of education was authorized to determine whether the state had provided by law a system for the appointment and tenure of personnel in the state department of education upon the basis of merit and efficiency. How could he do that without practically prescribing civil service rules for the state? There were many other provisions in the bill, such as those regarding adult education and rural library service, which showed a clear indication on the part of the authors of the bill to tell each state how it should run its educational system.

The truth is that Congress will not appropriate federal money except

on certain conditions which, however just they may be, limit the freedom of the local school system. The truth is that no federal commissioner of education can dispense three hundred million dollars a year without having a predominant voice in the manner in which local schools shall be run. The history of federal control has always been the same. The federal government has contributed more and more money, and has demanded more and more voice in the control. I believe that the federal control of education, eliminating local self-government in government, would abandon one of the real safeguards of freedom in the United States.

There are a number of arguments made in behalf of such federal control of education. If analyzed correctly, and carried to their logical conclusion, they would justify federal control of everything, and the complete elimination of local self-government.

In the first place, it is said there is a lack of equality in providing education, which is unfair to the children in the poorer states. It is undoubtedly true that children in the wealthier states obtain a more expensive education. I have never felt that the amount of money spent per child is quite the infallible guide which the writers on education seem to regard it. But, in any event, the federal government has never guaranteed equality in education to the people of different states. That has never been and never was regarded as a function of the federal government. If that government is going to guarantee equality in education, why not guarantee equality in wealth and economic condition? If carried to its logical conclusion, the federal government would have to distribute largess to every poor state and take it from others. Some states are wealthier because of the natural resources, or because of the energy and ingenuity of their people, or for hundreds of other reasons, and that means they can afford to give their children a better education than states which have not those advantages. But while they have certain advantages, there are plenty of people who prefer to live in a poorer state without those advantages. I doubt if there is a single state which cannot afford a minimum basic education for its children. Some of those which would be most assisted under the general education bill are maintaining expensive state universities, and spending some of their money on professional athletics.

It is said that in some of the states education is poorly conducted. I have no doubt that is true, but on the whole the states and localities have done a first-class job; the best in the world. And the right to govern one's self badly is just as much an essential of freedom in a domocracy as the right to govern one's self well. You are not free if someone else steps in and takes the control away from you because he doesn't approve what you are doing. That's what tyranny is. In any event, those who assume that if the federal government steps in, the job will be perfectly done, overlook the fact that this has seldom been the result of federal interference. Government by bureaus in Washington, like local government, is sometimes successful and sometimes not. If it does go wrong, the whole nation suffers.

The third argument is that local governments have not enough money to maintain schools as some of the educational planners think they should

be maintained. It is quite true that state and local governments are handicapped in their raising of money. They cannot reach the large corporations and the large taxpayers with any tax heavier than those levied by surrounding states or they will lose their industries and their taxpayers. When a great new public burden arose from the unemployment of the thirties, the states were unable to provide additional revenues required for relief, and only the federal government could provide the funds which were absolutely essential.

But basically this does not apply to education. Schools have been the great concern of every community. The tax systems have been developed with a view to providing the revenue necessary for education above everything else. The people have insisted in nearly every community that schools be kept free from politics, and they have been willing to provide money for schools, through extra levies or otherwise, even if it required the hamstringing of other activities of local government. We are spending more than two billion dollars a year on education from local funds. If the local communities are not willing to support even their own schools, then we are at the end of local self-government in the United States.

There is another answer to the demand for federal money. It is said that the local communities do not have enough money, but the fact seems to be overlooked that the federal government has no money either. We are completing a year in which there will be a deficit of five billion dollars. Next year it will be ten billion dollars. The deficit has averaged three billion dollars for many years before the war. If the idea of the general education bill is to tap a new, lucrative source of revenue, it is only contemplating a mirage. Once we have balanced the federal budget, there will be more force in turning to Uncle Sam for education as well as everything else. The choice between local financing of education and federal financing of education under present conditions is really a choice between a pay-as-you-go local system and a federal system based on borrowing for current expense. I know that the school people themselves believe strongly in a pay-as-you-go system, and are just as much opposed to the federal government going bankrupt as any group of American citizens.

The reasons which I have given for opposing general aid to primary and secondary school education are not nearly so applicable to assistance in the field of vocational education, and possibly adult education. For a number of years the federal government has been spending fifty million dollars a year in aids to vocational education. Today it is financing a wide extension of that service to provide skilled workers for the defense program. The NYA and the CCC are participating somewhat in that work. It is a new field, which has not usually been provided for in the local financial picture. Federal interference does not affect the basic control of the educational system. Even in this field I believe we should be careful to preserve as far as we possibly can local independence in the administration of the program. Today the office of education is doing an excellent job, and doing it through the existing educational agencies. I see no reason in ordinary times for any direct federal vocational plan through a federal bureau like the NYA.

But I beg those concerned with education, if they do wish to safeguard freedom in the American democracy, to hold fast to local self-government in primary and secondary school education; to work out a system by which every state shall be a self-supporting unit. The people themselves do not wish to give up local self-government in education. I know of no matter in which all fathers and mothers are so intensely interested as the character of the school in which their children are being taught. They are interested in every feature of it, in the location, in the teachers, in the textbooks, and in the lunchrooms. They want a voice in saying what kind of men and women shall sit on the board of education. I remember in Ohio how difficult it was to get them to give up the small school districts and centralize even in the township. Of course they are tremendously concerned with the character of the philosophy taught to their children, and they have a right to be. Nothing is more likely to give arbitrary power to a ruler than a right to prescribe the kind of things which are taught to the children.

So long as each community determines for itself how its children shall be educated, we maintain one of the greatest safeguards of freedom that any nation can have.

The strong tendency today is to try to solve every problem of the nation by creating a new federal bureau and giving it wide regulatory powers. Very few people seem to care whether they override the bill of rights, or the division of powers, or the federal system. They act as if the function of government was to put into effect the ideas of the moment in every field of economics and sociology and education. That is not the real function of government. Every program that is presented ought to be discussed throughout the nation, and then worked out within the safeguards of freedom laid down by those grandfathers of ours who thought through to the bitter end the fundamental problems of government.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR THE SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

(Excerpts from statement of David I. Walsh, as contained in senate report 244, part 3, June 3, 1939. Minority view on S. 1305.)

I cannot give my support to the bill (S. 1305) to promote the general welfare through appropriation of funds to assist the states and territories in providing more effective programs of public education which has been reported by the committee on education and labor, and I am submitting this statement of my views as to this legislation and of the reasons why, in my judgment, it is both unwise and inexpedient and ought not to pass.

Its purpose is stated in the title as—

"to promote the general welfare through appropriation of funds to assist the states and territories in providing more effective programs of public education."

It rests upon the premise that the education of our youth is of the highest

importance to our national welfare and the economic and social advancement of society; that, taking the country as a whole, existing educational opportunities and facilities are variable and unequal and deficient in many particulars due to a variety of causes, one of which, without doubt, is an insufficiency of funds; in some cases due to indifference or neglect and undoubtedly, in other cases, to poor economic conditions.

No one who is open-minded and acquainted with the facts will dispute these premises. No one will deny that even though educational opportunities in the United States today are greater and educational facilities are better, and our entire system of education more democratic than anywhere else in the world, nevertheless, there is much room for further improvement, and, in my opinion more money alone will not accomplish all the betterment that is needed.

Educational opportunities are not and never have been uniform except in totalitarian states, and that is so because from the earliest day to the present day, public education has been primarily a local responsibility and largely supported by local taxation. The states have collaborated with the local communities and have supported state institutions for higher learning, but the federal government has not heretofore had any direct connection with the public-school system.

No one will deny that present-day concepts of social responsibility and present-day social and economic conditions raise grave and fundamental questions with respect to the scope and efficiency of our educational system. However, I repeat, mere spending of more money will not correct the present defects.

The premises upon which the present bill and its predecessors—which have been before the Congress intermittently for the past 20 years—rest, and its professed objectives, which are stated to be "to assist in equalizing educational opportunities" are widely applauded. Everyone will subscribe to the general proposition that equality of educational opportunity is a desirable objective.

The bill, however, and all others of its pattern present three other questions of far-reaching import.

The first question is whether the federal government, as a matter of sound public policy, ought to assume responsibility for public education throughout the nation and contribute substantially to the same out of the federal treasury and exercise an oversight thereof.

If we answer that question in the negative, we need to go no further.

The second question is whether federal subsidies to the public-school system can be maintained without ultimately bringing about a nationalization of our educational facilities and federalized bureaucratic control. This is an eventuality which the proponents of the present bill insists is not intended and which they maintain can be avoided. They contend that by the terms of the present bill that danger is removed.

I seriously question that conclusion.

The third question is whether it is safe and prudent for the federal govern-

ment to embark at this time upon the financial outlays and the future financial commitments comprehended in the program embodied in the present bill.

In my judgment, most emphatically it is imprudent and dangerous to do so at the present time. With the public debt increasing at a tremendous pace, with a long-continuing yearly deficit in income, it is no time, however meritorious the proposal may be, to begin new and far-reaching financial undertakings. With the unemployment problem still far from solved and relief expenditures continuing to be a primary necessity, it is imprudent, as a sound fiscal policy, to plunge into new undertakings.

The present effort to initiate a program of direct federal subsidies for education and federal oversight of our public-school system is not new. It is a revival upon a larger scale of the objectives sought and the program contained in the bill introduced in the sixty-fifth Congress in 1918 by the late Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia, and in the sixty-sixth Congress by Senator Smith and Representative Horace Mann Towner of Iowa, in the house, and then widely publicized as the Smith-Towner education bill.

It undertook to create a federal department of education and to authorize $100,000,000 annually in federal subsidies to the states for five specified educational purposes. This became the Towner-Sterling bill in the sixty-seventh Congress and the Sterling-Reed bill in the sixty-eighth Congress. These bills never came to vote in either branch of the Congress. Then there was a ten-year interval of subsidence so far as Congress was concerned in these demands for federal subsidies to education.

I do not subscribe to the doctrine that because our public schools and our educational facilities are a vital element in our national welfare that they thereby become the proper concern and implied responsibility of the national government.

Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported.

We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education.

We cannot undertake to subsidize our public schools out of the federal treasury and still leave the schools free of the taint of federal control. Federal domination of education will be the ultimate and, in my opinion, the inevitable consequence. The present bill is the opening wedge—the camel's nose under the tent.

Let it be remembered that the most potent weapon of dictators and revolutionists is the control of the schools and the education of the youth. Let us be on our guard against putting the public schools in our own land under the yoke of a centralized bureaucracy and thereby provide the mechanism for possible abuse in the years to come.

And if these reasons were not enough for the rejection of the present bill and others of its kind, let us give heed to the financial implications. The appropriations authorized by the present bill over a six-year period aggregate $900,000,000, an average of $150,000,000 annually.

This is only the beginning. The advocates of this program of federal grants-in-aid to the states for educational purposes freely concede that very much larger federal subsidies in years to come will be essential if the objective sought—of equalized educational opportunities—is to be attained.

In my judgment it is utterly unconscionable at this time of dire need and general business depression to superimpose this new and permanent financial load upon the already staggering total of federal expenditures for relief, better housing, national defense, and the other long list of federal activities and federal responsibilities.

Where is this new money to come from? It will come in the first instance from new loans floated by the treasury to be met in years to come, sometime, somehow, by taxation. The money is not in reality a "gift" by the federal government to the local communities for their schools. It comes in the end out of the pockets of all our citizens in taxes, direct or indirect, drawn into the federal treasury and then passed back in the guise of a gift but with strings attached—the strings of federal control.

If we are to spend increased sums of money for education of our youth it must be provided in the end by the people, out of their earnings and their savings. Let the people determine the amount with their eyes open and let them regulate and oversee the spending of it, in their own way.

Aside from the underlying implications of nationalization of education, the financial aspects of this federal subsidy program is in the final analysis a device whereby it is intended that funds shall be siphoned out of the communities and the states that are presumed to be "rich" and poured into the communities and the states that are presumed to be "poor," via the federal treasury.

The cost of education is one of the principal expenditures of the state and local governments. It is the chief item in the financial budgets of states and their municipal subdivisions. Tremendous financial sacrifices are made by some states and communities to maintain a reasonably high standard of education. Staggering costs are met by many citizens with meager incomes to provide an education for their children in private educational institutions because of a particular or special training desired which the public schools cannot provide. Upon what principle of justice can the people of such states or communities have to place an additional tax burden on them in order to improve the educational system of some other state, unwilling or disinterested in striving for the best educational facilities?

In many states the principal source of revenue for support of the public educational system is the tax on real estate. In communities where the valuation on real estate for taxation purposes is high and the tax rate is also high, better educational systems exist. In communities where the valuation on real estate for taxation purposes is low and the tax rate is also low, inferior educational facilities prevail. This is true even within the states. We are now attempting to make the first pay more taxes to help the latter group or else lower their standards to help bring up the standards of the latter. They are "bled white," now. Many of our large cities today are in desperate financial circumstances. Why punish them because of their generous financial sacri-

fices in the past by demanding from them for those communities which may have made little or no effort in the past?

Statistics have been compiled by students of taxation which indicate that there is a variation in the various states of the ratio of existing true value of general property from 20 to 125 per cent. The same spread exists also between the several states and their subdivisions in the tax rate levied on general property. Some states have income taxes and others have none; some states have sales taxes and others have none. Indeed, there are a great variety of taxes that some states have that others do not have, the revenue from which, in many states, goes into the general fund out of which educational systems are maintained. I again inquire, how can you define a "poor" state needing federal aid for educational purposes unless you take into account the burdens already assumed by some states and communities and the burdens that other states and communities have refused to assume for educational purposes by high assessed value and taxes levied against those values and the many special taxes imposed to maintain, directly or indirectly, the educational system of a particular community or state?

In other words, why should the taxpayers of the communities, who taxed themselves excessively to maintain high standards of education, be further taxed to assist in uplifting the educational systems in the so-called poorer communities—"poorer" because in many instances their tax values and tax rates are low?

It is either the financial limitations which states and communities impose upon themselves—and have a right to do—or actual neglect in some cases, that is responsible in many cases for the so-called substandard school. If property is valued much below its real value for taxation purposes and but a small percentage of the state or community income is expended for educational purposes, how can it be claimed a community or state is poor and needs assistance from another state that is expending generously upon its educational system?

The people of one state have a right to demand, before having additional taxes imposed upon them to help improve such a distinct local function as education, that the valuation of real estate for taxation purposes and the money raised by taxation for educational purposes be equalized everywhere and operated on a pro rata basis.

What this bill is undertaking to do is actually to punish by further taxation the states, communities, and citizens who have sacrified most in the past to improve the educational opportunities for their children. This means that to apply this plan of national aid to education, we must enter into the field of interference with what has been the most basic and fundamental of all local rights—the right of allowing people to levy taxes according to their own needs and desires.

For all of the above reasons, I dissent from this bill and urge its rejection.

THE REAL PERIL OF FEDERAL SUBSIDIES

(An article by J. J. Tigert in the Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 12-15, July, 1934. Reprinted by permission of The Nation's Schools and the author.)

Gradually the federal government has been assuming powers that were originally exercised by the states and local units of government. The depression has greatly accelerated the tendency toward greater federal participation in the affairs of the states and the people. In fact, this process has developed more rapidly during the present emergency than at any time in our history.

The bulk of our citizenship entertains more than an ordinary degree of appreciation of the courage, skill and energy of President Roosevelt in coping with these most perplexing problems. His initiative was highly instrumental in restoring the confidence of the American people at a time when their faith in leadership, both of a public and private character, was all but lost. The nation owes the President a vast debt of gratitude. It should be observed, however, that the whole recovery program has been carried forward on an emotional basis, similar to the spirit in which we have been accustomed to prosecute wars.

This emotional flavor is mentioned not by way of condemnation, for I appreciate that this was essential to provide popular enthusiasm for the President's plans, but in order to call attention to the fact that social movements attended by phenomena of this kind frequently take on a different aspect with the return to normal feeling and thinking.

Let us assume that the emergency measures which the President has brought forward have saved us. Certainly his handling of the banking situation was superb. Without federal assistance, it is probable the whole banking system of the country would have crumbled into chaos, bringing unspeakable tragedy in its wake. It may be conceded that without federal succor the railroads would have gone to pot. Who can imagine what dire consequences would have followed such an event? Unquestionably the agricultural situation has been critical ever since the inflation stimulated by the World War. Although it is still far from satisfactory there have been unquestioned advances.

Everyone who takes a modicum of interest in schools is aware of the pitiable plight precipitated upon the nation's schools by the economic stringency. There is no need to rehearse the tale of woe of schools closed, of terms shortened, of teachers and studies eliminated, of salaries reduced and unpaid, of countless children neglected and unprovided for.

I am not questioning these various programs which have been projected during the emergency. How much of this emergency program will finally become permanent is entirely another question. Some persons evidently anticipate that we are to go still further on the road to federal paternalism. Others are equally confident that there will be a reaction toward state and individual rights. Time alone will answer this question. Let us make a calm examination of the necessity and wisdom of the federal govern-

ment's embarking upon the financial support of public schools as a permanent policy under normal conditions.

There is no conveyance by the states, in the federal constitution, to the federal government of power in relation to schools. If the federal government is to be justified in participating in the educational program of the states, it can be done only under a very specious appeal to the general welfare clause in the preamble. Possibly in this way most anything might be included within the power of the federal government.

Many advocates of federal subsidies for the schools do not believe that federal control or federal interference is involved in federal support. Inevitably federal control must accompany federal support. My experience in handling federal subsidies for education under the limited acts which are now in existence has taught me that you must either have federal control and interference or you must have misappropriation of funds and waste. The method, whereby the federal government has stimulated certain types of education in the states through lands and moneys under the Morrill, Smith-Hughes, Smith-Lever and related acts, is well known.

It is interesting to observe that this policy was inaugurated during an emergency in which the very existence of the federal government was at stake. The first Morrill act was signed by Abraham Lincoln while the Civil War was in progress. There was profound anxiety as to the ability of the union to preserve itself. Trained man power, food and materials that would provide the sinews of successful war might prove insufficient. Accordingly, the act made large land grants, subsequently followed by cash subsidies, to institutions, in the states which would teach agriculture, the mechanic arts, and provide military training.

Higher education at that time was largely confined to general culture and professional training in the old established occupations. Sooner or later it was inevitable that a nation like the United States, carved out of a vast undeveloped territory, would have to provide for the teaching of the scientific principles which apply to the development of land and its resources. It was just as evident that the greatest industrial nation of all time would have to have technical and engineering schools. In this instance, national policies adopted in an emergency proved helpful and necessary for the permanent welfare of the people and the country generally. Certain other federal subsidies came into existence in the crisis incident to the World War. For example, the Smith-Hughes act was passed about that time.

Federal funds which go to the land-grant colleges and universities are checked by the U. S. Office of Education. The Smith-Hughes funds are now merged into the office of education. The Smith-Lever and various other acts relating to agricultural education are administered by the United States department of agriculture. The Office of Education has never found it necessary to interfere seriously with the operation of the land grant colleges in the use of the Morrill funds, although opinions of the attorney general of the United States indicate that such interference is possible.

Only once as commissioner of education did I find it necessary to recom-

mend that all the funds available be withheld because of obvious waste in a certain institution. The federal board for vocational education has required the state boards to submit definite and detailed plans in advance for the expenditure of funds appropriated under the Smith-Hughes act. This board has maintained a regional organization and regular inspection. During the time that I served on the board, we found it necessary frequently to withhold funds or require adjustments so that the money would not be misused by the state boards.

The department of agriculture has always kept a close supervision over the funds dispensed through it. It has a policy of rigid inspection. The federal board of maternity and infant hygiene, which was composed of the surgeon general of the public health service, the chief of the children's bureau, and the commissioner of education operated for eight years upon a basis similar to the federal board for vocational education. The states were required to submit their plans for approval of the federal board. There were a number of states which refused to cooperate with this board and would not accept the federal funds under its management.

It is an unfortunate fact that the supervision of educational affairs is still highly involved in politics in most of the states, the chief educational officer being compelled to engage in partisan campaigns. The same is true of local school officers, particularly in the county and similar units, with the general exception of city officers. This promiscuous handling of school matters by politicians, long deplored by practically all educational bodies and leaders, greatly complicates the efficient handling of educational funds and in large measure accounts for the necessity of some kind of federal control to prevent misapplication. Some advocates of federal aid to schools have recommended that the money be turned over to the state officials and divided in proportion to the number of children of school age or some similar principle. Such a method of distribution, with the schools subject as they are to political exploitation, could end only in much waste and eventual scandal.

It is common knowledge that, for reasons akin to those mentioned, state funds which have been provided for the schools have been often misapplied and sometimes wrongfully withheld. Legislatures have tried to cope with this problem by passing acts attempting to make the school funds sacred or inviolate, with varying degrees of success. Possibly a dozen states have made considerable progress in a program of professionalizing the administration and supervision of the schools. There is no immediate prospect that the schools can be taken out of politics in many of the remaining states.

Another factor which adds to the difficulty in the efficient use of federal funds for schools is the fantastic assumption that the average citizen has concerning federal money. Most people consider money coming from Washington like the gifts that they get at Christmas time. They seem to forget that federal money, like state, county, district, and city money, must be raised by taxation. It has been well established in practice that money collected by taxation will be expended with less waste near the source.

Reason and experience both indicate that federal money cannot be expended wisely and efficiently except by exercising federal control and super-

vision and even then there is considerable waste; witness, for example, the huge pork barrels, such as the appropriations for rivers and harbors and other matters which are the result of logrolling, trading, and political self-interest. If we embark upon a program of turning over federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is federal control.

The soundness of a policy of federal aid does not depend upon the ease with which money may be made available for the schools, the amount that can be secured, the promptness with which obligations are met, and considerations of this kind. The answer to this whole question should be determined in the light of the interests of the people and the welfare of the country.

Is federal control of school matters consistent with the national welfare? The amount of supervision which will be necessary to promote the honest and efficient expenditure of money will bring us face to face with a peril that may eventually lay the axe at the roots of American institutions. The administration of schools in this country has been a necessary and appropriate corollary of representative government. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed emancipation from tyranny and called attention to the establishment of government by the consent of the governed.

Closely conforming to monarchal ideas, systems of education in European countries have been administered by individuals who are the creatures of a central government. The organization, the courses of instruction, the selection of personnel, the methods of teaching, and vital matters of this kind rest with a minister of education or similar officer in some European countries. In the United States, we have hoped that both government and schools could be placed under the direction of the people themselves or their representatives.

Unquestionably, democratic government has some weaknesses. It is probably less efficient than a government under an absolute monarch or a dictator who is able and honest. The best apology that can be offered for popular government was advanced by the New England statesman, Fisher Ames, who was indirectly quoted by Emerson in his *Essay on Politics:* "Fisher Ames expressed the popular security more wisely when he compared a monarchy and a republic, saying that a monarchy is a merchantman, which sails well, but will sometimes strike a rock and go to the bottom; while a republic is a raft, which would never sink, but then your feet are always in water."

If we turn over to the federal government the responsibility of the operation of the schools, we have forged the weapons whereby some able and self-seeking individual or group may some day transform our political, social and economic system. Lenin, working with a vast, unwieldy and almost illiterate population in Russia, was able to bring about a *coup d'état.* His system could not have survived for more than fifteen years if the school system and the agencies of popular information, such as churches, newspapers, books, clubs and assemblages of the people, had not been either completely eliminated or brought under control. The Russian people today are powerless to know or think except those things that the government would have them know and

think. It is hardly necessary to enlarge upon the extraordinary peril which would be encountered by excessive central control of our schools. Probably no one who advocates federal aid would disagree with the opinion here expressed. They would probably insist that nothing of this kind is contemplated.

The history of our country is a plain revelation of gradual usurpation of powers by the federal government. There is hardly an instance where the federal government has embarked upon the financial support, operation or regulation of matters pertaining to the states or individuals where there has been retrenchment. The regulation of alcoholic liquors is a notable exception. Jefferson said the cure of democracy is more democracy. Whenever we have attempted to cure by federal intervention, usually the result has been more federal intervention. There is every expectation that once Uncle Sam's camel gets his nose into the educational tent, he will some day come inside.

A sure concomitant of federal support is the destruction of local support. It has been stated that tax money expended close to the source is expended more carefully because there is more local interest. People are more careful of their own money than somebody else's. The people develop more interest and initiative in regard to enterprises in which they put their money. If manna is to fall out of the heavens for the benefit of the schools, localities will inevitably cut off necessary financial support. Interest and enthusiasm, which in many places have been too little, will diminish in a corresponding degree.

It is accepted that state support is necessary to have efficient schools which provide anything like equal opportunity for children in different localities. And yet, state aid is sometimes attended by a certain amount of loss of local interest and support. In 1931, the legislature of Florida wisely increased the state appropriation for public schools. Unfortunately, funds were never made available to carry out fully this legislation. This deplorable situation was further enhanced by the fact that many county boards and district boards cut down the financial support that they had been giving the schools because of the increased appropriation by the state.

When all the state funds failed to appear, the schools suffered a double disappointment. As surely as the night follows the day, increased responsibility by the federal government for the financial support of schools will be attended by decreasing support in certain states and localities. Even though the financial losses are small, popular interest which has been built up slowly and tediously will disappear quickly. Where a man's treasure is there is his heart also.

I have shown that federal aid to the schools must be attended by federal control, under present conditions, if we are to avoid general waste and misuse of these funds. I have also pointed out that federal control will tend to become greater and that centralized operation of the schools is a menace to our institutions and ideals. Finally, let it be observed that there is no necessity for federal aid under normal conditions whatever we may do in times of emergency like the present. All the states are able to maintain a uniform efficient system of schools on all levels from the kindergarten through the university without severely taxing their resources. A bulletin, published by

the National Education Association, which goes into the question of the income, wealth and ability of the different states to support schools shows that no state is unable to finance its own school system.

This bulletin was based on information collected by the U. S. Office of Education, the National Industrial Conference Board, the National Bureau of Economic Research, and other reliable agencies just previous to the onset of the depression, and the information assembled reveals the fact that in 1926 no state was expending more than 4½ per cent of its income on support for its schools, while many were spending less than 2 per cent. The percentage of value of school property in relation to all property was scarcely over 2 per cent in the states where it was highest and, in some states, it was less than 1 per cent. The same bulletin shows that the expenditure for schools in the various states is a mere fraction of the amounts expended for various other things of much less importance.

A similar bulletin, published in 1932, on facts on school costs presents the same data for the year 1930, after the depression had begun to make itself felt. There is some increase in the percentage of school costs in relation to the income of the states, but this is not sufficient substantially to alter the situation. In 1930, the highest percentage of school costs in any state was approximately 6 per cent of the state's income. This varied down to a minimum of approximately 2 per cent in the lowest state. Neither is there any significant difference in the percentage of value of school property in relation to all other property within the states. This item varied in 1930 from something over 3 per cent in the highest to less than 2 per cent.

In this connection it should be noted that in 1930 there were 128,840 fewer children under five years of age in the United States than there were in 1920. We have passed the peak of population increase in the United States. Social and economic pressure, resulting in birth control, has halted the population increase in a way similar to the situation which has long existed in France and some other countries. This definitely means that the burden of supporting schools will be relatively less in the future than it has been in the past.

It is evident that there is no necessity for federal financial assistance to the schools under normal conditions as no state, even in prosperous times, has ever expended more than a trifling proportion of its resources on schools.

FEDERAL POLICIES IN EDUCATION

(Excerpts from an address by Alexander Inglis before the Department of Superintendence, February 27, 1922, as carried in the Educational Record, volume 3, pages 114-125, January-December, 1922.)

Lest there be any doubt concerning my attitude toward federal subsidies for public school education, let me state at the outset that I am totally opposed to any participation by the federal government in the support and direction of our public schools, not only because I believe it involves policies subversive of our entire theory of government, but also because I believe it involves policies which in the long run are bound to be bad for education itself. I believe that the policy of granting federal aid in support of

public school education is fundamentally unsound as a policy of government; that it is dangerous for education; that it is bad economic policy; and that it is essentially unfair.

Having thus taken a position which probably appears extreme to the majority of this body, I am in duty bound to give my grounds for assuming that position. But before attempting this it is necessary to clear the ground of the jungle growth of tangled thought which may interfere with the free swing of our axe at the deadly upas tree of federal subsidies.

In the first place let us recognize that in all parts of this country public education is very, very far from being that which we should all like to see it, that in parts of the country it is almost unbelievably bad, that vocational education has scarcely begun to be recognized, that the amount of illiteracy and of near-illiteracy is alarmingly great, that attention to physical education throughout the country is almost negligible, that our large foreign population constitutes a serious problem for education and for society, that most country children do not have anything like a fair opportunity for education, that in many sections of the country short school terms make effective education all but impossible, that a large part of our teachers lack proper education, training, and experience—let us recognize these and many defects of education too numerous to catalogue. They are conditions which cry aloud for reform in the appealing voices of children deprived of their rights as American citizens. They are undoubted and indubitable facts which cannot be ignored.

But it is a far cry from recognition of the defects and needs of education to the conclusion that those defects should be or will be remedied and those needs met by some form of federal subsidies. Such a conclusion has no necessary relation to the single premise of present inefficiency, and denial of a policy of federal subsidies does not for a moment imply any unwillingness or unreadiness to take effective steps for the improvement of existing conditions. It is sheer demagogism to charge those who oppose federal subsidies with failure to appreciate the needs of education or with unreadiness to improve existing conditions. The problem to be faced is not one which involves the question of recognizing and remedying those conditions: it is one which involves solely the question of the best methods to be employed. It is not a question of whether we shall try to meet the needs of education. It is a question of whether we shall call upon the federal government to participate in the support and control of public education or rely on those means which have in the past been almost wholly responsible for the development of a system of education which, in spite of all its defects and shortcomings, constitutes one of the greatest achievements of the American democracy.

Back of all arguments for federal subsidies for education lie two premises which are worthy of consideration: (1) That there is great need for improvement; (2) that states and communities have shown themselves unwilling or unable to remedy the grave deficiencies which are readily recognized. The first of these premises is undoubtedly sound and need not be debated. The

second has by no means been established and deserves far more serious consideration than it has received. It is well worth while to consider briefly both the question of the readiness of states and communities to improve educational conditions and the question of their ability properly to support education.

Are states and communities unwilling or unready to assume and perform their proper responsibilities for public education and to remedy existing defects? There can be no doubt that all states have in some degree been delinquent in provision for important educational needs. There can be no doubt that many states have long permitted intolerable conditions to continue. Fundamentally important educational needs have long been neglected by states and communities. We cannot too strongly condemn such neglect. But the facts of the situation have not always been considered carefully by those who would cut the Gordian knot of education with federal subsidies and by federal participation in the support and control of public education. Without diminishing in the least our disapproval of defects in state school administration, we should recognize certain facts which in part explain, though they do not excuse, some of the conditions which we so strongly regret.

It is a fact that some of the conditions which we criticize are the direct results of our very attempts to improve education. An example of this is found in the problem of teacher supply, a problem in no small degree created by our attempts to extend facilities for education and to extend the amount of schooling provided. More schools, more children in school, and an extension of provisions for compulsory attendance—these things have created a demand for teachers that could not possibly be met in any brief period and cannot be met over night by legislative fiat.

A second fact to be kept in mind when we examine the delinquencies of states and communities is the fact that it is only recently that even educators have really become conscious of actual conditions. It took a great war and the draft to make us realize the perils of illiteracy, the demand for Americanization, and the needs of physical education. It has taken a new science of education and comprehensive surveys to bring existing conditions and needs to the consciousness even of specialists in education. It is not too much to say that our conceptions of public education have been all but revolutionized within the past two decades, and it is a legitimate question whether we have not attempted to progress too rapidly. Certainly we cannot criticize states and communities for their failure completely to adjust their education systems to all the multitudinous needs that have been recognized in their fullness and actually created only within a decade or less.

It is true, of course, that many defects of education have long been recognized and are still to be remedied. But it is also true that within recent years authorities in almost every state have been trying hard, and have been succeeding gradually, to remedy those defects. There are few states which at the present time have not fairly definite plans for the elimination

of the short school term, for the removal of all illiteracy, for Americanization, for improvement in physical education, for the development of practical and vocational education, for the improvement of the teaching force, and for most of the other improvements which might be considered as likely subjects for federal subsidies. In all parts of the country the disclosures of the selective draft, extensive surveys, and criticism from within and without have stung the public conscience to the quick, and there is observable an almost feverish endeavor to blot out the delinquencies of the past. Is this to be chilled by the cold blast of the federal subsidies and federal interference? I for one pray that it may not be.

But it may be said, and it has been said, that some states have not the resources or wealth to permit the proper development and care of education unless they receive assistance from without. This has been stated more frequently than any attempt has been made to establish its truth. The fact is that at present we have no means of knowing what the available wealth of any state is, and if we had such information we have no way of determining how poor a state must be to require federal assistance for the maintenance of an effective system of public education. If there are states actually unable to support an efficient system of education, the number is certainly small. In the speaker's judgment not a single state in this country is financially unable to maintain an efficient school system. The fact is that those states which cry poverty are usually the very states which least have attempted to provide for an efficient system of taxation. It is incumbent on those who argue for federal relief to prove that states are financially unable to meet the demands for education.

That states vary in resources and in taxable wealth is obvious. What then? Shall we for that reason attempt an equalization of wealth throughout the country for school support? Any such procedure can mean but one thing—the complete nationalization of educational support and control. Until we are ready to do that we must ignore national differences in resources and in taxable wealth. It is clear, of course, that the policies of equalization in support within states are a totally different proposition from any national equalization in school support, since the state is already the recognized agency of control and administration. Equalization of support is feasible and proper only within the unit of control.

The practice of granting federal subsidies for education is bad governmental policy. The moment anyone supports such practice he is forced to choose between the two horns of a vicious dilemma: either he must advocate a policy of granting subsidies without provision for their supervision, accounting, and control; or he must advocate a policy of granting subsidies with definite provision for some control over their uses. In the one case he contemplates the expenditure of public funds with little or no assurance that they shall actually be expended so as to accomplish the ends designed; in the other case he contemplates interference in the control of education by those primarily responsible for its administration in the several states—and that at long distance and with respect to special projects. On the

one hand he faces the example of the wasteful dissipation of public lands and public money granted to the states throughout the 19th century; on the other hand he faces the example of the intolerable interference with educational policies involved in the Smith-Hughes act. There is no escape from this vicious dilemma, either horn of which involves bad governmental policies.

Nor can it be argued that the federal government can safely delegate authority and responsibility for the proper and effective use of federal subsidies to the state authorities. In all probability state departments of education can be relied on to see to it that federal funds are honestly expended for the purpose for which they were granted, at least within the letter of the law. But the appropriation of funds is determined primarily by state legislatures, and by their juggling of budget items and the assignment of budgetary appropriations it is perfectly possible to defeat the whole intent of federal subsidies. This the federal government is powerless to prevent, unless possibly by an intolerable and unheard of form of federal control. Even the famous (or infamous) "fifty-fifty" policy of federal subsidies can guarantee only that at a given time additional state funds shall be expended and additional attention paid to the special object of the subsidies—always with the possibility that by the manipulation of state funds, of the state budget, and of appropriations, the state may rob Peter to pay Paul and the general development of education be advanced not a bit.

If the policies of federal subsidies were ones which involved bad governmental practice but could be shown to be favorable to educational development, one might be inclined to submit to governmental defects for the sake of educational gains. However, in the judgment of the speaker, the practice of granting federal subsidies to the several states in supposed aid of education is not only bad governmental policy but a policy which in the long run interferes with the proper development of education itself.

It is always possible to give a temporary stimulus to any enterprise by means of a special subsidy, and education in any locality can always be raised temporarily to a higher level by means of aid from without—at least as far as the special object of the subsidy is concerned. Such a practice, however, appears to have an inevitable tendency to result ultimately in the lowering of the educational morale of the local public through the lessening of local initiative, interest, and responsibility. The inherent defect of outside aid is that it operates to sap the vigor of local responsibility. Paternalism in any form inevitably generates a sense and practice of dependence. Once begun, dependence on outside support or control demands constantly increasing operation of the outside agency, and the ultimate result can only be reliance on that outside agency. Some of us believe that within the state such a result is inevitable and, all things considered, eminently desirable. Are we ready yet to go further and look toward the complete nationalization of educational support and control? Such is the legitimate expectation if we continue on the road which we have entered within the past decade. We should call a halt. Certainly we should understand clearly the policies on which we have embarked. Again let us not be deceived by

the disclaimers of any intent to develop any federal centralization of education. We must judge from the character of their acts and of their recommendations rather than from their statements of intent.

The practice of granting federal subsidies for education is not only bad governmental policy and bad educational policy; it is also bad economic policy. It would seem to be a principle of practical finance that wastefulness in the expenditure of public funds is in direct proportion to the remoteness of the appropriating agency from the source of supply. On the whole, communities are less wasteful than counties, counties less wasteful than states, and states far less wasteful than the federal government. People can see the uses to which is put money taken from them for expenditure within the community; they keep some track of county expenditures, they are not without thought for state funds, but they lose all sense of responsibility and sometimes all conscience when it comes to the matter of federal funds. The wastefulness of the federal government, even in matters in which it is primarily concerned and in which it acts directly, has become proverbial. When it reaches out into fields with which Congress is but little acquainted and with which it can deal but indirectly, the federal government appears to proceed almost without chart or compass. In education, Congress can but reach out in the dark, since it can deal but indirectly with educational administration.

LET US NOT BE DECEIVED

(Excerpts from an article by W. B. McPherson in the Nation's Schools, volume 15, pages 27-28, June, 1935. Reprinted by permission of the Nation's Schools and the author.)

For the last two years a militant minority of school executives and educators has been attempting to secure more general federal financial aid for schools. They present their program as being necessary to meet the emergency situation which now confronts us; they plead that it will not bring with it federal control and that it need not be permanent. Let us not be deceived! Let us not be so blinded by our present needs as to lose sight of the true facts in the case.

If the schoolmen of this country accept federal aid for education they must expect with absolute certainty that this aid will be permanent, that it will mean ultimately federal supervision of schools, that this supervision will be undesirable if not actually dangerous. This supervision will tend to become more and more exacting as time goes on.

Can anyone point to any government aid that benefited an organized minority which has ever been withdrawn if once extended? The whole history of our government has been one of constantly increased aids rather than intelligently increased or decreased grants. Political pressure is too great to expect any other course to be followed. We need to cite only two examples.

Land grants for educational purposes increased from one section in thirty-six in the earlier states to four in thirty-six in the last states admitted to the

union. The herculean labor required to bring about even minor retrenchments in veterans' reliefs in 1933 and the rapidity with which the original payments are being apologetically restored clearly show the difficulty of stopping or decreasing federal aids if once they are started.

I am not disposed to argue against either of these two aids but merely to use them as examples of the permanency of federal grants. In school administration then, as in pork barrel legislation in times past, we may expect to find the attitude, "Spend more! Spend wildly! Uncle Sam is paying the bills."

We should recognize the fact that federal aid to schools is an already established fact. Our national government has given enormous sums, indirectly, to our schools. Today the demand is for direct financial aid in addition to these indirect aids. It might be well now to spend some time in consideration of the characteristics and results of these indirect aids. For the sake of convenience we may divide them into the pre-Morrill and the post-Morrill aids.

The pre-Morrill aids had their beginning at the time of the organization of the old northwest territory by the famous ordinance of 1787. This law provided that the sixteenth section in every township should be set aside for the support of public schools. The government extended this policy in 1848 and again in 1896 when first two and then four sections of land in each township of newly admitted states were given for school support. During the administration of Andrew Jackson the treasury surplus, which amounted to $28,000,000, was divided among the states for internal improvements. Some of the states placed their shares in funds for the support of public schools.

Three characteristics of these grants and their disposal must be noted. In the first place they were given by a government that could afford to be generous and even extravagant. The public lands were, at that time, regarded as something to be disposed of as quickly as possible. The money grants came out of a treasury surplus. Second, the grants were made unconditionally except for the restriction implied in the phrase, "for common schools." The third consideration is the most vital. Almost without exception these grants have been wasted, dissipated or lost. The federal aids of this type became a political football and a source of lucrative graft in more than two-thirds of the states benefited. Of the twenty-six states that were given cash grants in 1836, only seven have any considerable portion of the fund today.

In 1862 during the heat of the passions aroused by the Civil War, the Morrill act was passed. This act marked the beginning of a new era in the relation of the federal government to schools and education. It granted to each state a certain acreage of land for the support of a college of "agriculture and the mechanical arts." It provided for a degree of federal supervision over these schools. Observe that the curricula were to a considerable measure dictated by the act. For military reasons it was provided that these colleges should teach military training.

It is unnecessary to tell schoolmen of the constantly increasing federal control over these colleges and their experimental stations. In 1917 the system was extended to high schools by the Smith-Hughes act. Here, too, we

find constantly increasing control and supervision on the part of the federal government.

Nor can we reasonably expect federal aid without federal control. It is not sound finance, it is not sound educational administration, and it is not even sound politics for a government to appropriate money without controlling the manner in which it is to be spent. Let us suppose that, at first, no control would be planned in the federal aid program. Waste and graft would certainly spring up as in times past, and the demand for control would become so great that it would have to be heeded. Even if no dictatorial supervision were attempted, it must be remembered that words of whispered request accompanied by the clink of money are more potent than the most forceful commands.

The friends of the federal aid proposals constantly assure us that submission to federal control will not be obligatory upon any school system. However, we must submit to control and conform to federal requirements or not get our feet in the public trough. What school administrator facing the inevitable pressure of local taxpayers would dare to refuse to conform and submit!

Federal aid, then, must bring in its wake federal supervision. Is this desirable? No. In the first place federal supervision will inevitably lead to stagnation and retrogression in educational procedure. Standards once established will be changed with difficulty because of political pressure and bureaucratic inertia. Any progressive state superintendent of schools can tell of many laws relating to the public schools of his state that should have been repealed long ago but cannot be for political reasons. Standards that would encourage and stimulate backward communities will tend to be accepted as desirable maximums by now advanced communities. Experimentation, healthful divergence from norms in procedure, and local ingenuity will be destroyed by uniform standards. But one example need be given to show this threat. Today our federal government has complete control of the Indian schools. Who can point to a Winnetka experiment, the development of a Gary plan, or any other far-reaching educational advance in these federally controlled schools?

Ours is a big country, its interests are many, its natural resources are widely divergent, and its people differ from one another in customs, racial characteristics and cultural backgrounds. No central agency in Washington can intelligently or efficiently supervise the educational system of our nation.

In 1925 the federal government made "an exhaustive survey" of child labor conditions in North Dakota. For the benefit of my readers who may not know Dakota conditions, allow me to explain that the average North Dakota farmer produced that year about 3,500 bushels, or twenty-five "loads" of grain for sale. Allow me to explain that it was then a rare farm family in that state that did not have at least one pleasure car in addition to the farm truck. The traffic jams in a North Dakota town on a Saturday night would make Hennepin avenue or La Salle street look tame by comparison. I know. I was born in the state and lived there for almost thirty years.

Yet after "an exhaustive survey," the children's bureau reports, "The average North Dakota farmer whose *yearly* trip to town with his *load* of grain constitutes his sole contact with the outside world. . . ." If this is an example, and I maintain that it is a fair example, of the knowledge of local conditions and of the intelligent understanding of community needs which the federal supervisors will apply to the educational problems in your school, do you want federal supervision?

When we consider the political dangers inherent in a centralized national control of education, we are forced to agree that no present emergency in education can be so great as to make federal supervision desirable. In at least two European countries of today minority political parties are entrenching themselves in power for years to come by forcing their tenets and beliefs upon the youth through their public school systems. An educational system under federal control will be one which, in all probability, will be at the beck and call of the political party in power. Can we imagine a situation in which Republicans favor nursery schools and Democrats oppose them? This is no more unreasonable than prohibition as a campaign issue between the parties.

Part of the priceless birthright of American education is freedom from partisan political control, freedom from control by the central government, local responsibility, and the right intelligently to interpret present day politics to our pupils.

SHALL IT BE "YES" OR "NO" ON FEDERAL AID?

(Excerpts from an article by S. M. Brownell in School and Society, volume 49, pages 668-671, May 27, 1939.)

In February, 1938, the report of the advisory committee on education to the President recommended direct federal financial aid to education. More than two score articles approving or opposing the suggested legislation have appeared in educational and other magazines since that time. Proposals are now before Congress to carry out the recommendations of the report. Because of the importance of these legislative proposals, it would seem that they should be searchingly studied particularly by persons in the field of education. Here, therefore, are proposed seven questions which seem essential in candid scrutiny of any federal aid proposal before we decide to support or oppose it.

1. *Is the case for federal aid to schools established by the facts?*

The report of the advisory committee, studies by the National Education Association and other similar studies have revealed startling inadequacies in the schooling provided in many parts of the United States. They have shown through studies of population mobility and otherwise that the consequences of inadequate education in any portion of the United States are of direct importance to any or all other sections of the country. They have graphically exposed the inequalities of educational opportunity existing between states and within states. They have demonstrated, too, that ability to

raise taxes for education varies tremendously as between states. Their conclusion is, therefore, that federal aid is essential. Perhaps that is one answer. It may be the best answer, but it would seem that in arriving at this answer the investigators have failed to display whether several exceedingly important considerations have been thoroughly studied.

(a) *They have failed to indicate the trend as to educational facilities.* Revelation of *status quo* fails to consider the direction in which this country is moving educationally. Is reasonable progress being made under the present pattern of organization and support of education toward remedying the deficiencies which they so graphically portray as being in existence?

(b) *They have failed to show the possibility of states' reorganizing their educational program so as to be more effective.* With the facts presented by the report, is it reasonable to suppose that the deficiencies will or can be remedied by the states? For example, the educational leadership in New York state instigated the regent's inquiry into the cost and character of education in New York state. Perhaps it would be well to have such a searchingly thorough study made in each state (if necessary with federal aid toward the expenses of the inquiry), but looking toward increased efficiency by more effective use of existing state support and control before coming to the conclusion that federal aid is the only and best way out.

(c) *They have failed to point out that federal aid is but a superficial attack on a more fundamental problem of providing an economic level for the entire population which will permit self-support of necessary governmental agencies as well as comfortable subsistence.* Federal aid, even though much more extensive than proposed, would at best merely be providing crutches for crippled education without proceeding in the direction of reaching the condition where the crutches could be discarded. It would, therefore, seem pertinent to have evidence provided that the patient is so critically ill that crutches are essential now, even though they will make him dependent rather than independent. Evidence might likewise be sought to ascertain whether or not in the long run education would profit more by having the money proposed for federal aid to education utilized in the direction of providing an economic level for the entire population which will permit self-support of education under existing state support and control.

2. *Is there any good reason to believe that federal aid will bring about the desired better schools?*

On the one hand, we have presented to us arguments indicating that there will be no federal control accompanying federal aid. Alongside, we find evidence showing the inadequacy and inequality of education in states able to support a good educational program, and evidence of inefficient or inadequate efforts by these states to eradicate inequality and inefficiency within their borders. If there is to be little or no federal control accompanying federal aid, what right have we to expect major improvement of the education within states under the same leadership that they now have? Thus, if federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some federal control. If, then, with federal aid comes federal control, perhaps we should

examine the possibilities of securing better schools through this federal control.

Many possible evils of federal control have been expressed to the point where a majority of the reports are vigorously opposed to it. I shall not discuss these possible evils or their validity, but rather point out what we must recognize, of course, that, as in the case of evils associated with control, there is no virtue in federal control that does not or may not reside at least in part in state control. We must be aware, too, of the difficulty of curing local inefficiency or failure to meet local needs and desires when power becomes more remote from the local community. With all the benefits possible from able administration of large units we have only to examine the report of the regent's inquiry and to inquire into applications of PWA or relief in localities to see frequent examples of communities being handicapped in meeting local needs efficiently because of their remoteness from the source of authority. In addition, as we recognize the necessity of educational improvement resting upon able leadership, we must reckon with the fact that any federal educational agency must draw for leadership from the same sources now available to local communities and to states.

3. *If federal aid* (and control) *does not prove to be satisfactory, what is the chance of change away from federal support and control?*

First, we should perhaps consider the probable difficulty of getting people who have received federal aid to reject it in favor of local taxation. Some indication of the resistance against withdrawal of direct federal aid to education, once it started, is possible if we cite the opposition now evident to attempts at returning support and control of relief to localities because of the fact that federal handling of relief has been widely criticized for inefficiency and abuse, or we may consider the difficulty that has been found in getting people who have received direct relief to shift back to work as a source of their support.

As a further consideration we should recognize the inertia that resides in any large unit reaching out to all sections of the country and which has established heavy vested interests. Once federal aid is established, this inertia to continue that would have to be overcome would exist in an even greater degree than the inertia of non-federal aid, which is one large factor that proponents of federal aid are finding they must overcome. Thirdly, when it is recognized that the proposed federal aid would extend to teacher training, state departments, adult education and public libraries as well as to elementary and secondary education, there is the possibility that it would mean federal subsidy (and control) so extensive as to make very few persons engaged in education entirely free from its possible influence and, hence, in a position to criticize objectively or resist the imposition of good or bad policies and practices with a feeling of complete immunity. In considering the proposal of federal aid, then, it would appear that such a step cannot be dismissed merely as an experiment which could be dropped if unsatisfactory after a few years' trial. Nor does the proposal seem to be merely an added step in federal participation in education similar to preceding steps. It seems more reasonable to consider such a step essentially as one would look at any

proposal to adopt a permanent policy that is new and untried in the United States.

4. *Is the proposed method of distribution of funds sound and in line with the purposes of the bill?*

The argument behind the recommendation for federal aid is that there are educational inadequacies which need to be eradicated. Forty-eight separate states have been faced with exactly the same problem. It would seem probable, therefore, that any federal proposal would represent at least in part the plan utilized most successfully by one or more of the states. Whatever proposal is made for distribution of federal funds, then, it would seem desirable that evidence be presented as to how this plan has worked in statewide fashion to attain the similar goal of eradicating inadequacies, reducing inequalities and stimulating special phases of education.

SOME ARGUMENTS AGAINST FEDERAL AID

(An article by Paul C. Stetson in the Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 25-26, September, 1934. Reprinted by permission of the Nation's Schools and the author.)

The greatest administrative problem facing boards of education and administrators is that of financing education. The primary financial question confronting them today is not the details of the administration budget—the technique of that has been well established—but it is the financing of the budget.

We are committed to the principle of state support for public education. There can be no valid argument against the principle that public education is a state function and that, therefore, it is the obligation of the state, in part, to finance the public schools. How the states will meet their obligation is a troublesome problem, but not one with which we are particularly concerned now. The question that is really causing great anxiety at the present time is the increasing emphasis that many persons are placing on the need and the desirability of federal aid.

Dean William Russell of Teachers College, in an address before the convention of the department of superintendence last February, set forth the following six-point program for federal aid: (1) $50,000,000 for immediate aid for the balance of this year to keep schools open, to be administered on any basis by a board or individual in Washington; (2) $100,000,000 for next year for the same purpose, to be administered by a board in Washington upon some objective basis; (3) a substantial sum (we thought of $300,000,000 or $400,000,000) upon the principles of equality and efficiency; (4) loans to the localities secured by frozen assets in banks and taxes anticipated; (5) grants for school buildings; and (6) $30,000,000 for college students.

Dean Russell's address deserves careful study. It is particularly interesting to note that he states, "In fact, if the principle of equality and the principle of efficiency were to be applied to the nation as a whole, we should

be safe in recommending to Congress that by far the best way to meet the immediate emergency in education would be to grant to each state a sum of $11 per pupil in average daily attendance for the school year 1932-33, with a slight additional amount for the less densely settled states. No board of strategy would be needed . . . minimum programs would be cared for. Schools could be reopened. . . . Local control would be preserved. It would be the best way to meet the emergency."

The third point outlined by Dean Russell is, of course, the important one in the financial program he advocates. Many persons feel that an appropriation of $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 by the federal government, to be distributed automatically to the various states, is only the first step toward the nationalization of the schools. Those who feel that the schools, if granted federal aid upon the basis proposed by the advisory commission, can escape the dangers of bureaucratic control are completely blind to the history of federal grants of money.

Federal aid for stricken areas where every attempt has been made to finance the schools is a project that should have the support of all, but federal aid granted to all states upon an automatic basis raises problems that seriously disturb many friends of the public schools.

In the first place, these people feel that federal support, whether given upon an automatic basis or according to any other formula, means federal control. The advocates of the proposed plan deny this and hope to safeguard the schools from such control, but there is such a perfect illustration of federal control of education in the activities of the vocational education board that those of us who have dealt with that board are skeptical of the statement that control of the schools, in the event of large grants of money, will not be vested in the federal government. There is a fundamental law, not yet outmoded, that control goes to the source of the financial support.

An illustration of such control is found in the activities of the various relief employment commissions and boards set up by the federal government for the administration of relief in local areas.

It is doubtful whether it should be otherwise. The federal government certainly should not be expected to grant large sums of money annually for the support of the public schools and not ask for any accounting thereof. In fact, if the federal government should grant large sums of money for that or any other purpose, it would be failing in its duty if it did not assume a certain responsibility for the expenditure of that money.

A second reason for not favoring the third point of the six-point program outlined by the advisory commission is that, with a few exceptions, there is no question about the inherent ability of the states to support an adequate program of education. Indiana and Ohio are illustrations of two states in the same geographical territory that are having entirely different experiences in the financial support of their schools. If Indiana, with half of the population and one-third of the wealth of Ohio, can support an adequate program of education, should not Ohio, one of the most prosperous and populous

states in the union, be able to maintain an adequate system of public schools?

The difficulty in Ohio, as in most of the other states, is not lack of financial ability to support a program of education. Rather, it is lack of a plan through which to finance a program of education. Financial problems confronting the various states, cities and school boards, in the main, do not arise primarily from lack of financial resources; they come primarily from political interference, from outmoded forms of government, from antiquated taxation machinery, and from a refusal on the part of the legislators and their leaders to face the issues squarely and frankly. Because of the failure of states to reorganize and modernize their taxation procedures, to replan the present county and state systems of government, and to force legislators to meet the issue on its merits instead of upon its political implications, certain of our wealthiest states have faced and still face serious financial problems.

The cure is not to join the "On to Washington" movement but to force, through the creation of public sentiment and the formulation of definite plans, reforms within the states which will make possible an adequate program of decent government and support of the schools. The price which states and localities will pay for temporary relief from the present emergency will be so great that the results will not justify paying that price. The price which states and localities would pay for that temporary relief would be to surrender, eventually, the control of the public school system to the federal government.

Nationalization of schools would inevitably result and nationalization in a country as large as the United States would spell the death of progress. Political domination of local school systems is not uncommon, but the units are so small that when conditions become bad enough the people rise and wrest control of the schools from the dishonest politicians. Political domination of the schools in a state is possible, but here again the unit is small enough so that the will of the people eventually would make itself felt. But political domination of public school systems through federal government presents possibilities which have caused many persons to refuse to subscribe to the demand that this or the subsequent Congress take the first step toward nationalization. If the federal government should assume control of the public schools, one of the basic principles upon which the entire American system is founded would be endangered—local control of state and municipal governments.

Finally, many of us fear that advocating federal support for state or local school units will retard the progress that is being made toward state support of the public schools. Within the past three or four years state governments increasingly have become aware of their obligations for the financial support of school systems. Indiana is an excellent example of a state which, in 1933, undertook a large measure of the financial support of its public schools. The result of that has been that no schools have been closed in Indiana and that this year, so far as is known, no school district

has failed to meet its financial obligations. The prospect of large grants of money from the federal government would undoubtedly tend to make many state administrations less ready to formulate and carry out adequate plans for the financing of education.

The plight of Michigan and Ohio is explained, in part, by the activities of these minority groups who were successful in getting through constitutional amendments which seriously limit the abilities of many local governments in those states to finance properly any type of municipal government.

State support, in part, for the public schools and national aid to those areas which have completely exhausted their resources seem to be the indicated solution of the present troublesome financial problems rather than outright grants of federal money, on an automatic basis, to states or local school systems.

EDUCATION AND GOVERNMENT

(Excerpts from an article by Alfred E. Smith in the Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 12-16, September, 1934. Reprinted by permission of the Nation's Schools and the author.)

The time has come for men and women who believe in democracy to declare the simple truth that government can be no better than the schools that prepare youth to bear the rights and privileges of citizenship.

We are not interested in saving schools for their own sake, but we are greatly concerned as to the part the schools will play in shaping the thought and will of our people toward solving the problems of government. We are troubled not so much because some schools have closed, but rather because every child may not have the opportunity to so much of education as will enable him to keep his part of the world going right. We are not so much interested in the size of the school tax bill, as in whether we are getting the best possible return for every dollar invested. We do want to know that the public schools are attacking surely and effectively the problems that a changing industrial civilization is forcing upon our people.

Good can come out of this depression. The apparent breakdown of public education during the last three years is due not so much to the depression as to the weaknesses that have been developing during a generation. We had come to accept the public school as we accept the telephone or the automobile without thinking much of its purpose or its work. As a people we had for the most part ignored repeated warnings that the economic foundations of our state school systems were crumbling, that the educational machines created in the first half of the nineteenth century were breaking down under the load required by changing conditions of the twentieth century.

Neither the school nor its work is something to be taken for granted. "WE, the people" determine what these schools will do. We create institutions to prepare teachers. We tax ourselves in order that the schools may

help children and youth fit themselves for the work of adult years—in a broad sense, to exercise the rights and privileges of citizenship in a democratic society, or, as Madison stated it, to be their own governors.

"WE, the people" cannot satisfy our obligations by merely creating something we call a school, by placing certain of our citizens in charge, and by committing our children to their care for a period of years. We, too, are citizens and must share with these citizens and teachers an understanding of the purpose and work of the school and the responsibility for its success or failure. I speak not because of my interest in the school, but because of my belief in the public schools as profound contributors to the strength or weakness of the states of the nation.

As a result of its system of taxation and its method of equalizing educational opportunity through a state plan of financing schools, New York's educational system has withstood the economic storm better than most states. No schools have been closed. The minimum school year of 190 days has been maintained. The state salary schedules are intact. With minor exceptions, no needed school service has been abandoned. New York has avoided those stupid attempts of society to make little children pay for adult folly and mismanagement. As the economic tide turns, New York is ready to move forward on a sound, progressive educational program.

Other states, I am told, have not fared so well. The reasons are not hard to find.

The National Survey of School Finance disclosed that of the 48 states, 42 draw from 75 per cent to more than 99 per cent of their revenue for the support of schools from the general property taxes. Thirty-three of the states draw less than 25 per cent of their school revenue from the state; and 14 per cent of them less than 10 per cent.

There is a close parallel between those states that place the burden of the support of schools on the general property tax and those that delegate or mandate the responsibility for the support of schools to the local districts. The general property tax is the only tax of any consequence available to the local district. When the taxable wealth of the district is low the income for education must suffer; when taxes are uncollectible, schools must close.

On the other hand, as has been pointed out, the state can tax income and forms of wealth beyond the reach of local taxing districts. Particularly, can the state tax wealth where it is and distribute the income from such tax on an equitable basis for the education of all children of the state regardless of their environment or of the taxable wealth of the district in which they reside.

There is today urgent demand for the federal support of education. I am not opposed to a fair and efficiently administered emergency program of federal support for public schools, but it behooves all friends of public education to give careful thought to the question of long-term federal aid.

The forefathers, strong in their support of education, left the responsibility of developing systems of schools to the several states. It is axiomatic

in American government that control follows support. Men may cry federal aid without federal control, but so declaring does not determine the outcome. In Russia, in Italy, in Germany, we have within our own day seen the school system of a people diverted to the purposes of a single political party. Whoever pays the fiddler calls the tune.

The problems of public education cannot be solved in these states until tax systems have been revised to relieve general property, especially agriculture, and to tap those sources of revenue represented by income and segregation of wealth. They cannot be solved until the state—each state—has found an equitable means of taking the state's income where it is and distributing such income through equitable means wherever children are. Such tax systems must be overhauled. The state itself must guarantee a reasonable standard of educational opportunity to every child within its borders. Until the several states take these two related steps, there is little hope for public education through federal subsidy.

One other issue ought also to be placed in the records. The administrative machinery of our public school systems is antiquated, ineffective, expensive, unsuited to the needs of our day and generation. Around every city and village of consequence, urban population has overflowed into the country. Improvements in transportation and communication have forever eliminated the need for a schoolhouse within walking distance of every child. The assumption that laymen can perform the administrative duties necessary to the operation of a modern educational program is a travesty. The time has come to overhaul the educational machinery of our state school systems.

To formulate an educational program in terms of the government we want, to reorganize the administration of public education, to revise our state systems of taxation, to guarantee a reasonable equalization of educational opportunity to every child in every nook and corner of this land—these are problems to test the faith and courage of all citizens. First and foremost, they are problems for the several states. In every state, let the citizens assemble, let them formulate their programs. Let them keep these programs before their legislative bodies until favorable action has been taken. Let no governor, legislator or citizen assume that he has served his day and generation, that he has contributed to the progress of government until he has helped his state reach a fair solution of these problems.

NO FEDERAL FAILURE

(Editorial in the Greensboro Daily News for June 24, 1942.)

"The failure of the federal government to equalize educational opportunity is one of the chief reasons for the large percentage of selectees in the army who are illiterate or who have no mechanical skill," says a report of the federal aid committee of the southern states work conference made to the summer conference of the North Carolina Education Association at Durham last week by Jule B. Warren, chairman.

Mr. Warren adds that in his opinion federal aid to education in the south is the only ultimate solution.

The Daily News has almost reached the point at which it is ready to resign itself to federal aid for education hereabouts—not because we believe that it is best or even the only way out, but because southern educational leadership is headed in that direction and will have to learn, along with the rest of local economists, that there is a jumping-off place in federal aiding.

But we are not yet ready and will not soon be to admit that the illiteracy in selectees, in North Carolina, anyhow, is due to anybody except those who have accepted the responsibility for educating the children of the state. They have not been given everything they asked for or all that they needed to do a perfect job; but they have had the means and the authority to see to it that no normal person reached first draft age without being able to read and write.

We say that deliberately.

To be sure federal aid might have raised wages which could do with a bit of boosting and certainly would have created more jobs, but it could not have seen to it that the school law was enforced. It would have supplied funds with which to have held more educational conferences; but it is not at teachers' meetings that illiterates of school age are rounded up and put to work in the classroom.

We repeat that blame for the illiteracy of North Carolina draftees rests upon the North Carolina public school system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Package libraries on the subject of federal aid to education may be obtained from the Library Extension Department of the University of North Carolina. These package libraries will be sold at 25 cents each. They will be ready for distribution on December 15, 1942. Address the Library Extension Department, Chapel Hill, N. C. Payment should accompany the order.

The H. W. Wilson Company has published a 286-page number of the Reference Shelf, volume 14, No. 10, on the subject, "Federal Aid for Education." Julia E. Johnsen, compiler. Price, $1.25. Address the H. W. Wilson Company, 950 University Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The University of Texas published in 1941 a 281-page debate handbook, entitled "Equalization of Educational Opportunities." Joseph M. Ray, compiler. The price of the handbook is 35 cents a copy. Orders should be sent to the Bureau of Public School Service, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. Payment should be made in the form of coin, money order or check. The bureau does not accept stamps in payment for bulletins.

Bower Aly has for sale copies of the National University Extension Association's handbook, volume 1, entitled "Equalizing Educational Opportunity by Means of Federal Aid to Education," September, 1934. The handbook is 220 pages in length. The price is $1.00; however, a bookseller's discount of 20 per cent from this price will be allowed to member schools of the North Carolina High School Debating Union, if the fact of such membership is noted on the order. Address Bower Aly, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

The Library of Congress has published a bibliography of the debate topic. The principal or debate coach might write for this to the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

The Office of Education has prepared a bibliography of the debate subject. For this bibliography, the principal or debate coach might write the Office of Education, Federal Security Administration, Washington, D. C.

The National Education Association will be able to furnish some material and a list of references on the debate subject. For this service, the principal or debate coach should write the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States may be enabled to furnish some material on the debate subject. Address this organization at Washington, D. C.

The report of the National Advisory Committee on Education, published in 1931 and entitled "Federal Relations to Education," contains material of value in the study of the debate topic. It is suggested that the principal or debate coach make inquiries concerning copies of this report to the American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Education, F. W. Reeves,

chairman, published in 1938, contains material of interest in connection with the study of the debate subject. For information concerning the availability of this report and the price, address Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Hearings on S. 1305 before the U. S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor, March 2-10, 1939. 373 pages. For information concerning the availability and the price of the hearings on the 1939 federal aid to education bill, address Superintendent of the Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Hearings on S. 1313 before the U. S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor, April 28-30, 1941. 402 pages. For information concerning the availability and the price of the hearings on the 1941 federal aid to education bill, address the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

American School Board Journal, volume 88, pages 23-24, May, 1934. "Who Will Pay the Federal Aid?" J. H. Goldthorpe.

American School Board Journal, volume 91, pages 17-19, November, 1935. "North Carolina's State Supported Public School System." J. H. Highsmith.

American School Board Journal, volume 102, pages 50-51, March, 1941. "Education and Economic Well-Being." J. K. Norton.

American School Board Journal, volume 103, pages 20, 52 and 54, August, 1941. "Safeguards of Freedom in a Democracy." R. A. Taft.

American School Board Journal, volume 105, page 18, September, 1942. "Effects of the War Upon Public School Finance." Timon Covert.

American Teacher, volume 23, page 5, December, 1938. "Equal Chance for All." E. D. Thomas.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 129, pages 102-105, January, 1927. "Federal Subsidies for Education." A. F. MacDonald.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 207, pages 14-26, January, 1940. "The Future of Federal Grants-in-Aid." J. P. Harris.

Charlotte Observer for August 9, 1942. Editorial, "An Educated Army."

Charlotte Observer for August 14, 1942. Editorial, " 'Crisis' in Education."

Current History, volume 20, pages 926-931, September, 1934. "Dangers of Federalized Education." J. H. Ryan.

Education, volume 61, pages 70-74, October, 1940. "Federal Government and Youth." C. H. Judd.

Education Digest, volume 3, pages 44-46, December, 1937. "Federal Support of Education."

Education Digest, volume 3, pages 25-27, May, 1938. "Pressing Problems in Financing Public Education in the Southern States." H. A. Dawson.

Education Digest, volume 4, page 35, May, 1939. "Federal Aid and the Tax Problem." Clarence Heer.

Education Digest, volume 4, pages 34-36, May, 1939. "Shall Washington Control our Schools?" G. P. Schmidt.

Educational Record, volume 3, pages 114-125, January-December, 1922. "Federal Policies in Education." Alexander Inglis.

Educational Record, volume 11, pages 60-100, April, 1930. "Federal Relations to Education."

Educational Record, volume 14, pages 409-414, July, 1933. "National Survey of School Finance." P. R. Mort.

Educational Review, volume 63, pages 102-109, February, 1922. "Federal Organization for Education." C. R. Mann.

Elementary School Journal, volume 31, pages 94-95, October, 1930. "Federal Subsidies for Education."

Elementary School Journal, volume 36, pages 497-512, March, 1936. "Federal Support of Public Education." C. H. Judd.

Elementary School Journal, volume 37, pages 509-516, March, 1937. "Conflicting Views on Federal Aid." N. B. Henry.

Elementary School Journal, volume 38, pages 337-343, January, 1938. "Comparison of the Ability of Rural and Urban Areas to Support Education." P. R. Mort and E. S. Lawler.

Elementary School Journal, volume 39, pages 561-563, April, 1939. "Federal Aid to Public Education." Pat Harrison.

Elementary School Journal, volume 39, pages 664-677, May, 1939. "Educational Problems of a Changing Population." Newton Edwards.

Frontiers of Democracy, volume 7, pages 142-146, February 15, 1941. "Another Step Toward Federal Control of Education." A. E. Joyal.

Greensboro Daily News for June 24, 1942. Editorial, "No Federal Failure."

Greensboro Daily News for August 7, 1942. Article, "Public School Situation Described as Critical."

Harvard Educational Review, volume 8, pages 279-311, May, 1938. "Editorial Forum: Comments on the Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education."

High School Journal, volume 17, pages 43-45, February, 1934. Editorial, "Federal Aid for Education."

High School Journal, volume 21, pages 257-259, November, 1938. "Federal Aid to Education." F. P. Graham.

Journal of the National Education Association, volume 30, page 121, April, 1941. "Total Defense and Federal Aid for Education." H. A. Dawson.

Journal of the National Education Association, volume 30, page 165, September, 1941. "The Nation's Responsibility for Education." Lister Hill.

National Education Association Journal, volume 29, pages 9-10, January, 1940. "Federal Aid for Education." S. B. Hall.

National Education Association Research Bulletin, volume 15, pages 1-54, January, 1937. "Financing Public Education."

National Education Association Research Bulletin, volume 18, pages 131-182, September, 1940. "Progress in Rural Education."

Nation's Schools, volume 13, pages 20-22, January, 1934. "National Government Must Take Part in Financing Education." P. R. Mort.

Nation's Business, volume 14, pages 23-24, March, 1926. "Let's Stop This Fifty-Fifty Business." J. W. Wadsworth.

Nation's schools, volume 13, page 47, February, 1934. "Federal Support for Public Schools is Inevitable." Fred Engelhardt.

Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 9-11, September, 1934. Editorial, "Federal Aid Again."

Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 12-15, July, 1934. "The Real Peril of Federal Subsidies." J. J. Tigert.

Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 12-16, September, 1934. "Education and Government." A. E. Smith.

Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 25-26, September, 1934. "Some Arguments Against Federal Aid." P. C. Stetson.

Nation's Schools, volume 14, pages 17-19, November, 1934. "Five Principles Essential to Federal Aid for Education." J. C. Morrison.

Nation's Schools, volume 15, pages 27-28, June, 1935. "Let us Not be Deceived." W. B. McPherson.

Nation's Schools, volume 17, page 25, March, 1936. "Three Views of Federal Aid to Schools." C. H. Judd, L. D. Coffman, and P. R. Mort.

Nation's Schools, volume 20, pages 19-20, August, 1937. "Federal Aid Again." D. D. Henry.

Nation's Schools, volume 20, pages 37-38, November, 1937. "Figuring Financial Ability of States to Support Schools." L. L. Chisholm.

Nation's Schools, volume 20, pages 16-17, December, 1937. Editorial, "The Governors Worry."

Nation's Schools, volume 21, pages 23-24, June, 1938. "Price of Federal Aid." J. B. Edmonson.

Nation's Schools, volume 22, pages 18-20, July, 1938. "Federal Relations to Education, 1931 and 1938." H. S. Ganders.

Nation's Schools, volume 23, pages 25-26, January, 1939. "Why Fear Federal Aid?" C. M. Barker.

Nation's Schools, volume 23, page 39, March, 1939. "Reeder Tells Controls That Must Follow Federal Subsidies to Schools."

Nation's Schools, volume 23, pages 57-58, March, 1939. "National Aid is Imperative." F. H. Swift.

Nation's Schools, volume 27, page 19, February, 1941. "This Bill is Dangerous." A. B. Moehlman.

Nation's Schools, volume 27, pages 23-24, March, 1941. "Federal Controls Endanger Community Schools." A. B. Moehlman.

Nation's Schools, volume 27, pages 64-66, March, 1941. "Federal Aid by Distortion." M. M. Chambers.

Nation's Schools, volume 27, pages 29-30, June, 1941. "What Price the New Pattern?" G. M. Wiley.

New York Times, Magazine Section, for April 15, 1934, pages 3, 20. "Our Schools Face a Day of Reckoning." Eunice Barnard.

New York Times for July 3, 1934, page 15. "Implies Roosevelt Blocks School Aid." Eunice Barnard.

New York Times for September 1, 1942. Article, "Urge Correlation of Schools to War."

Peabody Journal of Education, volume 15, pages 233-241, March, 1938. "Pressing Problems in Financing Public Education in the Southern States." H. A. Dawson.

Raleigh News and Observer for June 6, 1942. Editorial, "Humiliating Rank."

Saturday Evening Post, volume 210, pages 10-11, December 25, 1937. "Why Send Them to School?" R. M. Hutchins.

Saturday Evening Post, volume 211, page 23, January 28, 1939. "Uncle Sam's Children." R. M. Hutchins.

School and Society, volume 29, pages 845-846, June 22, 1929. "Local Self-Government in Education." R. L. Wilbur.

School and Society, volume 38, pages 225-233, August 19, 1933. "Federal Financing of Education." W. F. Russell.

School and Society, volume 39, pages 287-296, March 10, 1934. "Federal Aid —Boon or Bane." W. F. Russell.

School and Society, volume 40, pages 41-48, July 14, 1934. "Federal Aid to Education." G. F. Zook.

School and Society, volume 40, pages 337-344, September 15, 1934. "The Implications of Federal Aid to Education." R. A. Kent.

School and Society, volume 41, pages 313-321, March 9, 1935. "Economic Aspects of Federal Aid to Schools." E. H. Hahne.

School and Society, volume 41, pages 383-387, March 23, 1935. "The Future Place of the Federal Government in Public Education." G. D. Strayer.

School and Society, volume 48, pages 61-65, July 16, 1938. "Federal Aid for Education." E. D. Thomas.

School and Society, volume 49, pages 557-562, May 6, 1939. "Federal Aid to Education." C. H. Judd.

School and Society, volume 49, pages 640-642, May 20, 1939. "An Argument for Federal Aid." L. L. Chisholm.

School and Society, volume 49, pages 668-671, May 27, 1939. "Shall it be 'Yes' or 'No' on Federal Aid?" S. M. Brownell.

School Executive's Magazine, volume 53, pages 262-263, May, 1934. "A Plea for Federal Aid." J. K. Norton.

School Life, volume 17, pages 85-86, January, 1932. "North Carolina's School Tax Revolution." A. T. Allen.

School Life, volume 20, page 3, September, 1934. "For Federal Aid Debaters." Martha R. McCabe.

Statistical Bulletin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, volume 23, pages 1-3, June, 1942. "How Illiterate are We?"

Teachers' College Record, volume 36, pages 91-110, November, 1934. "Objective Basis for the Distribution of Federal Support to Public Education." P. R. Mort.

Time, volume 39, page 51, June 15, 1942. "The New Illiterates."

Vital Speeches of the Day, volume 4, pages 650-652, August 15, 1938. "Drawbacks to Federal Aid of Education." G. D. Strayer.

STUDY OUTLINES

Vol. III. No. 3. *Studies in the History of N. C.* 1923. R. D. W. Connor.
Vol. IV. No. 13. *Great Composers, 1600-1900.* 1925. Paul John Weaver.
Vol V. No. 9. *A Study of Shakspere.* 1926. Russell Potter.
Vol. V. No. 10. *Studies in Southern Literature.* Revised Edition. 1926. Addison Hibbard.
Vol. V. No. 14. *Current Books: 1925-1926.* Cornelia Spencer Love.
Vol. VI. No. 4. *Studies in the Development of the Short Story:* English and American. 1926. L. B. Wright.
Vol. VI. No. 9. *Studies in Modern Drama.* Revised Edition. 1927. Elizabeth L. Green.
Vol. VI. No. 12. *Studies in American Literature.* Revised Edition. 1927. Addison Hibbard.
Vol. VII. No. 4. *Our Heritage: A Study Through Literature of the American Tradition.* 1927. James Holly Hanford.
Vol. VII. No. 14. *The Negro in Contemporary American Literature.* 1928. E. L. Green.
Vol. VIII. No. 3. *Contemporary Southern Literature.* 1928. Howard Mumford Jones.
Vol. VIII. No. 4. *Recent Poetry from the South.* 1928. Addison Hibbard.
Vol. VIII. No. 9. *Contemporary Spanish Literature in English Translation.* 1929. A. B. and N. B. Adams.
Vol. VIII. No. 11. *A Study of South America.* 1929. W. W. Pierson & C. S. Love.
Vol. IX. No. 2. *A Study of American Art and Southern Artists of Note.* 1929. M. deB. Graves.
Vol. IX. No. 3. *A Study Course in American One-Act Plays.* Revised Edition. 1929. E. T. Rockwell.
Vol. IX. No. 7. *The French Novel in English Translation.* 1930. U. T. Holmes, Jr.
Vol. IX. No. 9. *Art History.* Mary deB. Graves. 1930.
Vol. IX. No. 10. *The South in Contemporary Literature.* 1930. Addison Hibbard.
Vol. X. No. 1. *Adventures in Reading, Third Series.* 1930. Marjorie N. Bond and Richmond P. Bond.
Vol. X. No. 6. *Other People's Lives, Second Series.* 1930. C. S. Love.
Vol. X. No. 7. *America and Her Music.* 1931. Lamar Stringfield.
Vol. X. No. 8. *Studies in Confederate Leadership.* 1931. F. M. Green.
Vol. X. No. 10. *Books of Travel. Revised Edition.* 1931. U. T. Holmes, Jr.
Vol. XI. No. 1. *Adventures in Reading, Fourth Series.* 1931. Marjorie N. Bond and Richmond P. Bond.
Vol. XI. No. 2. *The Far East, with Special Reference to China.* 1931. J. A. Robertson.
Vol. XI. No. 5. *Heroes of the American Revolution.* 1931. F. M. Green.
Vol. XI. No. 8. *Romance of the Western Frontier.* 1932. F. M. Green.
Vol. XII. No. 1. *Modern Russia.* 1932. E. E. and E. E. Ericson.
Vol. XIII. No. 1. *Twentieth Century American Literature.* 1933. Revised Edition of *Contemporary American Literature.* Marjorie N. Bond.
Vol. XIII. No. 2. *Other People's Lives, Third Series.* 1933. C. S. Love.
Vol. XIII. No. 5. *Adventures in Reading, Sixth Series.* 1933. M. N. Bond.

Single Copies, 50 cents; in North Carolina, 25 cents.

University Extension Library
Chapel Hill, N. C.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XXII OCTOBER, 1942 NO. 3

Sixth Annual

NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL ART EXHIBITION

APRIL 11 THROUGH MAY 1, 1943

FOR THE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF
NORTH CAROLINA

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

JUNIOR COLLEGES SENIOR COLLEGES

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Conducted by

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
at Chapel Hill

THE DEPARTMENT OF ART
THE EXTENSION DIVISION

THE WOMAN'S COLLEGE
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
at Greeensboro

THE DEPARTMENT OF ART
THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

Co-operating Organization

NORTH CAROLINA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

SPECIAL CHECK LIST

Before submitting entries to this exhibition, please check to see that—

1. You are properly classified as to unit (city or county) and level of competition.
2. You are properly classified as to group and individual entries.
3. If a group entry is made, it exactly fulfills the requirements.
4. You have mounted all group entries (excepting models, sculpture, etc.) on 22″ x 28″ cards.
5. If possible, you have mounted all individual entries, unless framed, on cards measuring 14″ x 19″, 18″ x 24″ or 22″ x 28″.
6. Duplicate entry blanks have been properly filled out for each entry.
7. Each entry has a blank affixed to it and a duplicate blank mailed to the Exhibition Committee.
8. The correct amount for entry fees is sent with the duplicate blanks.
9. Shipments are carefully packed and labeled on the outside with the name and address of the sender.
10. Your entries reach Chapel Hill by 5 p.m. on Monday, April 5, 1943.

SIXTH ANNUAL NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL ART EXHIBITION

The purpose of this exhibition is to promote the teaching of art and to encourage art production in the schools and colleges of North Carolina. By circulation of the exhibition after the initial showing, it will be possible to acquaint both teachers and pupils with the work being done in other schools and so to stimulate both art teaching and art production to a wider scope and a higher level.

DATES OF EXHIBITION

The exhibition will be held from April 11 through May 1, 1943, and will be divided between the two divisions of the University sponsoring it.

Exhibition of the Work of Elementary Schools

(Grades 1 through 6)

Weatherspoon Gallery, Greensboro.....April 12 thru April 20
Person Hall Art Gallery, Chapel Hill.....April 11 thru April 20

Exhibition of the Work of High Schools and Colleges

(Grades 7 through college)

Person Hall Art Gallery, Chapel Hill.....April 22 thru April 29
Weatherspoon Gallery, Greensboro.....April 22 thru May 1

LAST DAY FOR MAKING ENTRIES

All entries for the state-wide exhibition must be in the hands of the committee at Chapel Hill by 5 p.m. on Monday, April 5, 1943.

CIRCULATING EXHIBITION

All work accepted for exhibition will be retained by the Exhibition Committee for circulation as a traveling exhibit through North Carolina during the school year 1943-44. Exceptions will be made in the case of works which are not suited to the handling involved in the circulating of an exhibition.

Any school wishing to schedule the exhibit should make a reservation as soon as possible. Each exhibit center will be responsible for the expenses of packing and hanging and of transportation from the preceding exhibit center. It is suggested that schools obtain the sponsorship of the local Woman's Club for the showing of the exhibit. The 1941-42 Exhibition is now available. Use the form furnished to obtain more detailed information, or write the Department of Art, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

GENERAL RULES FOR THE EXHIBITION

Regulations

ELIGIBILITY

Work done since last exhibition by students of elementary schools, junior high schools, senior high schools, junior colleges, and senior colleges—public, private, or parochial—of the state of North Carolina, except that by students of the colleges conducting this exhibition, shall be eligible for submission to the exhibit.

JURY SELECTION

Only works which are selected by the jury shall be exhibited.

UNITS AND LEVELS OF COMPETITION

All elementary and high school work submitted shall be divided into two distinct units of competition determined by whether the school is in a city administrative unit or a county administrative unit. Under this system the work of county schools will be judged separately from that of city schools. All private and parochial schools shall be classed with the city administrative units.

The work submitted shall be grouped in the following manner for judgment, each group comprising a level of competition.

City Administrative Units and County Administrative Units

Grades 1, 2, 3 ..... level 1
Grades 4, 5, 6 ..... level 2
Grades 7, 8, 9 ..... level 3
Grades 10, 11, 12 ..... level 4

College Units

College Freshmen and Sophomores ..... level 5
College Juniors and Seniors ..... level 6

GROUP ENTRIES

Levels 1 and 2 *must* be submitted as group entries.

INDIVIDUAL ENTRIES

Levels 3, 4, 5, 6 shall submit individual entries.

NUMBER OF ENTRIES

In Elementary School there are no restrictions upon the number of entries which one school may submit.

In junior high school, senior high school, and college there are no restrictions upon the number of entries which one student may submit. It is advised that the problems be taken up as regular classwork, and that the individual entries be sent as a group in order to save shipping costs; but this is not obligatory.

ORIGINALITY

All entries must be original art work, not copies. Advice and criticism by members of the faculty will not be considered as affecting the originality of entries, but the students themselves must be responsible for the main conception and the execution. Any indication of a violation of this rule will exclude the work from the exhibition.

MOUNTING AND FRAMING

For Group Entries

All group entries which are in flat pieces should be submitted on 22″ x 28″ mounts but should have no further matting or framing.

For Individual Entries

Oil paintings should be submitted on canvas boards or stretchers and suitably framed.

Watercolors and pastels must be matted but not framed. Only one watercolor or pastel should be put in a single mat.

Neither frames in the oil class nor mats in the watercolor and pastel classes should exceed five inches in width. The design of both frames and mats should be simple and will be considered in the judgment.

All drawings in pencil, ink, crayon, or charcoal, and all prints must be mounted to one of the three following sizes: 14″ x 19″, 18″ x 24″, and 22″ x 28″.

Only one drawing, print, or design should be put on a single mount.

For All Entries

Charcoal drawings should be thoroughly fixed to prevent rubbing.

Pastels should be protected by heavy cellophane securely attached to the mat on all edges.

An entry blank must be filled out and attached to each entry. See ENTRY BLANKS below.

ENTRY BLANKS

A duplicate entry blank must be filled out for each individual or group entry. One of the blanks must be attached to the entry and the other mailed to the Exhibition Committee.

Entry blanks must be obtained from and returned to

Department of Art
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

The enclosed form may be used as a request for entry blanks.

An entry blank should be attached to each entry in the lower right-hand corner of the face of the mount. If the entry is of such a size or shape that the entry blank cannot be so placed, the blank may be mounted on a card of the same size (to prevent tearing) and attached by means of a cord.

The "entry number" applies to the number of entries made by any individual or school. For example, if one entrant submits six entries, the blanks should be labeled Entry No. 1, Entry No. 2, etc., through Entry No. 6.

If a group entry occupies more than one mount, place the blank on one mount, and in the lower right-hand corner of the other mount or mounts write the names of the school and the entry number for that school. A group entry will have only one entry number regardless of the number of mounts making up the entry.

ENTRY FEES

For Group Entries

An entry fee of fifty cents will be charged for each group entry.

For Individual Entries

An entry fee of twenty-five cents will be charged for each individual entry.

Payment of Fees

Entry fees must be sent with the entry blanks which are to be mailed. If fees are paid by check or money order, the check or money order should be made payable to the N. C. School Art Exhibition Committee.

CLOSING DATE

All entries, entry blanks, and fees must be in the hands of the Exhibition Committee at Chapel Hill by 5 p.m., Monday, April 5, 1943.

SHIPPING INSTRUCTIONS

All entries should be sent with charges prepaid to

Department of Art
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

All packages should have the name and address of the sender clearly written on the outside.

All objects are shipped at the risk of the sender. Work should be carefully wrapped, crated, or boxed. The co-operating Departments cannot be responsible for any loss or damage though all possible care will be taken.

RETURN OF ENTRIES

All entries accepted for the exhibition will be retained for a circulating exhibition (see page 3) and will be returned, charges collect, by May 1, 1944. Works excluded from the traveling exhibit because of size, shape, or fragility will be returned, charges collect, by May 1, 1943.

All entries not accepted for the exhibition will be returned, charges collect, by April 21, 1943.

COMMUNICATIONS

All communications concerning this exhibition should be addressed to

Department of Art
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

JUDGMENT AND AWARDS

The examination of art entries shall be conducted in a thorough manner by a judge from outside the State of North Carolina. This judge will have the sole power of selection of works to be included in the exhibit and the sole power of making awards.

First and second places shall be awarded in each class on each of the six levels of competition. A blue ribbon shall be given for first place and a red ribbon for second place. If more than one entry is considered of the first or second rank by the judge, more than one blue ribbon and one red ribbon may be awarded in any class. Honorable Mentions (white ribbons) shall be awarded at the discretion of the judge.

On the first four levels of competition the work of city administrative units and county administrative units shall be judged separately.

The judge will reserve the right to refrain from granting any of the awards if in his opinion the work submitted is not of a sufficiently high standard.

JUDGE—1943

Victor D'Amico: Director of Educational Project, The Museum of Modern Art, N. Y.; Director of Art, Sieldston School, New York City; Chairman, Committee on Art in American Education and Society.

CERTIFICATES OF AWARD

Certificates will be awarded to winners in each of the several groups by the N. C. Federation of Women's Clubs.

CLASSES OF ENTRY

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Grades 1, 2, 3 (Level 1) or Grades 4, 5, 6 (Level 2) may make *group* entries wherever indicated in the following classes:

Class 1—Illustration **Grades 1, 2, 3**
Grades 4, 5, 6

Group of six original illustrations, two from each grade of the level.

Any painting medium, chalk, crayon or cut paper may be used. At least two media must be represented in each group of six illustrations. (It is suggested that each picture be labeled as to the subject illustrated.)

Class 2—Posters **Grades 4, 5, 6**

Group of three original posters, one from each grade.

Any medium may be used: paint, chalk, block printing, etc.

Class 3—Modeling and Carving **Grades 1, 2, 3**
Grades 4, 5, 6

Group of six original pieces, two from each grade of the level.

Clay, wood, plaster of paris, or stone may be used.

Sculpture may be in the round or in relief.

Class 4—Watercolor Painting **Grades 1, 2, 3**
Grades 4, 5, 6

Group of six original watercolors, two from each grade of the level.

Opaque or transparent colors may be used.

Subjects may be landscape, figures, portraits, still life, etc.

Painting must not exceed 22″ x 28″ in size and need not be matted.

Class 5—Portraits **Grades 1, 2, 3**
Grades 4, 5, 6

Group of six original pieces, two from each grade of the level.

Any medium may be used.

Class 6—Prints **Grades 4, 5, 6**

Group of six original prints, two from each grade of the level.

Any print medium may be used: linoleum, wood, monoprint, etc.

Any subjects may be used.

Class 7—Costume Design **Grades 1, 2, 3**
Grades 4, 5, 6

Group of six original costume designs, two from each grade of the level.

Class 8—Costume Illustration **Grades 1, 2, 3**
Grades 4, 5, 6

Group of six original illustrations, two from each grade of the level.

The designs may be for plays, pageants, personal use, etc., and may be in any color medium.

Models may be used.

Class 9—Interior Design **Grades 4, 5, 6**

Group of six original interior designs, two from each grade of the level.

The designs may be for interiors of homes, offices, restaurants, schools, stage sets, etc.

Either color drawings or models may be submitted. A group of six may consist of six drawings or six models or of a combination of drawings and models.

Class 10—Surface Pattern Design **Grades 1, 2, 3**
Grades 4, 5, 6

Group of six original surface pattern designs, two from each grade of the level.

Patterns must be suitable for textiles, end papers, wrapping paper, etc.

Linoleum or wood block prints, oil, opaque watercolor, crayon, chalk, etc., may be used.

Class 11—Design **Grades 4, 5, 6**

Group of six original designs, two from each grade of the level. Single units, abstract or realistic in treatment, rendered in any medium of expression are eligible.

Class 12—Leather Tooling, Bookbinding, Metal Work **Grades 4, 5, 6**

Group of six original pieces of craft work of media listed. All may be same medium or combination of media may be submitted.

Class 13—Lettering **Grades 4, 5, 6**

Group of six pieces of manuscript writing, two from each grade of the level.

Class 14—Construction **Grades 1, 2, 3**
(Such as toys, marionettes, etc.) **Grades 4, 5, 6**

Group of six original pieces, two from each grade of the level.

JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Grades 7, 8, 9; grades 10, 11, 12 of high school; college fresh-

men and sophomores; and college juniors and seniors may make *individual* entries in the following classes:

Class 1—Pencil Drawing

Original black and white pencil drawing.

Class 2—Ink Drawing

Original ink drawing. This class includes pictorial work in black or colored inks or in a combination of both, executed in line or wash, with pen or brush, or with a combination of several techniques.

Class 3—Crayon Drawing

Original pictorial work in crayon.

Wax, conté, lithograph crayons, and colored pencils will be considered in this class.

Class 4—Charcoal Drawing

Original pictorial work in charcoal.

Class 5—Chalk or Pastel Drawing

Original pictorial work in chalk, pastel, or any other dry pigment.

Class 6—Oil Painting

Original pictorial work in oil made directly from life.

Class 7—Watercolor Painting

Original pictorial work in transparent watercolors made directly from life.

Class 8—Tempera Painting

Original pictorial work in tempera made directly from life.

Tempera includes show-card colors and all opaque or mat watercolors.

Class 9—Advertising Design

Original work in advertising design. This includes posters, car cards, magazine covers, mailing pieces, labels, or other types of advertising matter involving lettering and illustration.

Class 10—Costume Design

Original work in costume design. This includes designs for plays, pageants, personal use, etc.

Designs must be in color. Paints, crayons, colored inks, or actual fabrics may be used.

Models as well as flat designs may be submitted.

Class 11—Costume Illustration

Designs must be in color. Any medium may be used.

Class 12—Surface Pattern Design

Original surface pattern design suitable for development in

silk, cretonne, wallpaper, wrapping paper, or for some similar purpose.

The designs must be executed on paper or illustration board in opaque or transparent watercolors, wax or hard-pressed crayons.

Class 13—Interior Design

Original interior design for a home, office, restaurant, department store, school, church, stage set, etc.

Drawings or models may be submitted. If drawings are used, three are required for each entry: front and side elevations, and a floor plan.

Class 14—Textile Design

Original work in textile design.

The design must be on the actual fabric, and may be executed with paint, stencil, block prints, dye, batik, or crayon; or it may be woven.

Class 15—Design

Original design. Single unit, abstract or realistic in treatment, rendered in any medium of expression is eligible.

Class 16—Prints

Original work in linoleum or woodblock prints, etchings, dry-points, lithographs.

Prints may be in black and white or in color.

Class 17—Sculpture

Original work in sculpture.

Sculpture may be in the round or in relief.

Material may be chalk, stone, wood, plaster, bronze, or other hard composition.

The entry must not be fragile. Soap sculpture will not be accepted.

Class 18—Ceramics

Original work in ceramics. Examples of kiln-fired vases, tiles, bookends, lampbases, bowls, plates; or work in the round or in relief; or other objects modeled from clay will be considered.

Class 19—Leather Tooling, Bookbinding, Metal Work

Original pieces of craft work in any of the three media listed.

Class 20—Lettering

May be original poems, stories, etc., or may be material taken from books or other sources.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XXII NOVEMBER, 1942 NO. 4

ACADEMIC CONTESTS FOR NORTH CAROLINA HIGH SCHOOLS

Announcement for the Year 1942-43

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

EXTENSION BULLETINS

Vol.	IV,	No. 12.	*Children of Old Carolina.* Historical Pageant for Children. Ethel T. Rockwell. Price 50c.
Vol.	VII.	No. 9.	*Special Legal Relations of Married Women in N. C. as to Property, Contracts, and Guardianships.* Mary P. Smith. Price 50c.
Vol.	VIII,	No. 5.	*The World Court.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	IX,	No. 4.	*The Classification of Property for Taxation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XII,	No. 5.	*The Sales Tax.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIII,	No. 3.	*Radio Control and Operation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV,	No. 1.	*Play Producing for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and staff members of the Carolina Playmakers. Price 50c.
Vol.	XV,	No. 2.	*Socialization of Medicine.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI,	No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of Electric Utilities.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVI,	No. 4.	*Plays for Schools and Little Theatres (Revised).* Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII,	No. 3.	*Unicameral Legislatures.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVII,	No. 4.	*First Principles of Play Direction.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.
Vol.	XVIII.	No. 2.	*Anglo-American Alliance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XIX,	No. 2.	*Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XX,	No. 3.	*Inter-American Relations.* Price 25c.
Vol.	XXI,	No. 1.	*Audio-Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* (Free).
Vol.	XXI,	No. 2.	*Hemisphere Defense.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XXII,	No. 1.	*Audio-Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* (Supplement). Free.
Vol.	XXII,	No. 2.	*Federal Aid to Education.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.
Vol.	XXII,	No. 3.	*Sixth Annual N. C. School Art Exhibition.* 1942-43. (Free).
Vol.	XXII,	No. 4.	*Academic Contests for N. C. High Schools.* Announcement for the year 1942-43. (Free).

MONEY ORDERS, CHECKS, OR STAMPS ACCEPTED

ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION,

CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

ACADEMIC CONTESTS FOR NORTH CAROLINA HIGH SCHOOLS

FOREWORD

The Extension Division, in cooperation with departments of the University of North Carolina, has for some years provided for high schools of the State academic contests in various fields. These contests have been conducted during the spring term of each year, the superintendent, principal, or teacher of each school supervising the tests under specified regulations. This issue of the Extension Bulletin carries the announcement of the 1943 contests.

Each accredited public high school in North Carolina is cordially invited to enter these contests. (Other high schools may secure copies of the tests and enter on a non-competitive basis.)

Record of Contests

The first academic contest was conducted in the field of Latin, February, 1925. Similar contests were inaugurated in the fields of French, Spanish, and Mathematics, spring of 1926. A contest in Physics was added, 1937. *Each of these five contests has been held annually since it was instituted, this fact showing that the policy is approved by both school officials and high school students.*

Expansion

Because of the record just cited, and because this year there is unusual emphasis on sound scholarship, it has been deemed desirable to enlarge the number of contests. The pages which follow, therefore, not only outline the five former, but announce two new contests as well—these being in the fields of History and English. With many other school activities curtailed, and with such a wide selection available, the Extension Division hopes that many high schools will enroll for these contests.

Notice of intention to participate should be mailed at once, the fields of interest and the number of students entering each field being indicated. The first three copies of each test will be sent free of charge; additional copies may be had at 2 cents each. *Remittance should accompany order for additional tests. Postage stamps are acceptable.*

Address all communications to:

C. E. McIntosh, *Acting Secretary*
Department of School Relations
Box 1050, Chapel Hill, N. C.

GENERAL REGULATIONS

1. The Extension Division and the several departments concerned will, with the cooperation of participating high schools, conduct contests in the spring of 1943 in the following scholastic fields: Physics, Mathematics, French, Latin, Spanish, History, and English.

2. Each contest will be supervised by the superintendent, principal, or teacher in each school, the directions pertaining to each test being carefully observed.

3. No student who has already been graduated from a high school shall be eligible to participate in any academic contest.

4. Each participating student must be a regularly enrolled member of the high school in which the contest is held.

5. At the top of each paper submitted in a contest will be given: (a) the name of the school, (b) the name and address of the principal, (c) the name of the student who prepared the paper.

6. At the bottom of each paper the following pledge must appear: "I have neither given nor received aid on this test." Immediately below the pledge the student will sign his or her name. (Absence of the pledge will disqualify the paper.)

7. The school official responsible for each test will attach a statement that the test was conducted according to directions and will forward all papers *within one week from the date the test was given.*

THE HIGH SCHOOL PHYSICS CONTEST

(Test to be given on March 5)

1. Each school desiring to enter the Physics contest will send its order by February 20.

2. Students who may enter the Physics contest are limited to the sophomore, junior, and senior classes.

3. The examination will cover the topic of mechanics and heat.

4. All papers *will be mailed by March 12* to Box 1050, Chapel Hill.

5. Papers will be graded by members of the department of Physics of the University.

6. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

THE HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS CONTEST

(Test to be given on March 12)

1. Each school desiring to enter the Mathematics contest will send its order by February 25.

2. Students who may enter the Mathematics contest are limited to the sophomore, junior, and senior classes.

3. The scope of the contest will include: (a) an arithmetic test, (b) an algebra test, (c) a plane geometry test.

4. The individual school will select the best paper prepared by its students and *send this paper by March 19* to Box 1050, Chapel Hill.

5. Papers will be graded by members of the department of Mathematics of the University.

6. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

THE HIGH SCHOOL FRENCH CONTEST

(Test to be given March 19)

1. Each school desiring to enter the French contest will send its order by March 1.

2. The French contest is intended only for students in second year French who have had no special advantages nor private instruction in the language.

3. The scope of the contest will include: (a) a vocabulary test, (b) the conjugation of several representative verbs, (c) the composing of French sentences illustrating different grammatical points, and (d) a reading test.

4. The individual school will select the best three papers from the total number submitted and *send these three papers by March 26* to Box 1050, Chapel Hill. *The high school teacher is expected to score and to record the number of errors in each paper which is sent to Chapel Hill. (Papers which have not been scored and on which the errors have not been recorded will be automatically disqualified.)*

5. The papers submitted will be graded by members of the department of French of the University.

6. Announcement will be made of the best three individual papers in order of excellence. Announcement will also be made of the three schools whose three-student teams make the best showing.

THE HIGH SCHOOL LATIN CONTEST

(Test to be given on March 26)

1. Each school desiring to enter the Latin contest will send its order by March 10.

2. Students who may enter the Latin contest are limited to the sophomore, junior, and senior classes. (It is regarded as inadvisable for a student who has had less than a full year of Latin to attempt this examination.)

3. The examination will require an ability to translate passages of comparatively easy Latin and will include: (a) questions on form and syntax based on such passages, (b) questions involving a general knowledge of grammar.

4. The individual school will select the best three papers from the total number submitted and will *mail these three papers by April 2* to Box 1050, Chapel Hill.

5. The papers submitted will be graded by members of the department of Latin of the University.

6. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

THE HIGH SCHOOL SPANISH CONTEST

(Test to be given on April 2)

1. Each school desiring to enter the Spanish contest will send its order by March 20.

2. Students who may enter the Spanish contest are limited to the sophomore, junior, and senior classes. The contest will be of a practical nature, enabling the student to show what facility he has acquired in handling Spanish verbs, grammar, and reading.

3. The individual school will select the best three papers from the total number submitted and *will mail these papers by April 9* to Box 1050, Chapel Hill. *The high school teacher is expected to score and to record the number of errors in each paper which is sent to Chapel Hill. (Papers which have not been scored and on which the errors have not been recorded will be automatically disqualified.)*

4. The papers submitted will be graded by members of the department of Spanish of the University.

5. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

THE HIGH SCHOOL HISTORY CONTEST

(Test to be given April 9)

1. Each school desiring to enter the History contest will send its order by March 25.

2. Any high school student may enter the History contest.

3. In 1943, the test will cover the field of general American history. No special emphasis will be laid on any particular period.

4. The individual school will select the best paper prepared by its students and *will send this paper by April 16* to Box 1050, Chapel Hill.

5. The papers will be graded by members of the department of History of the University.

6. Announcement will be made of the school whose student wins first place. Honorable mention will be given to several schools whose students submit next best papers.

NOTE: The History department will gladly receive suggestions from history teachers with reference to future tests.

THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CONTEST

(Test to be given on April 16)

The Extension Division and the department of English have under consideration a proposal to conduct an annual contest for high school English students. If a desire to take part in such a contest is indicated by a sufficiently representative group of schools, detailed plans will be worked out and prospective participants notified. High school principals and English teachers are urged to submit suggestions concerning the nature of the examination or writing exercise which they would consider valid tests of superior achievement in English. It has been suggested that such an examination should include (1) an objective test of grammar, sentence structure, and usage; and (2) a vocabulary test.

Suggestions received prior to March 15 will be taken into consideration.

WINNERS OF ACADEMIC CONTESTS IN THE PAST

THE LATIN CONTEST

Charlotte High School, 1925; Lillington High School, 1926; Wilson High School, 1927; Roxboro High School, 1928; Durham High School, 1929; Durham High School, 1930; Durham High School, 1931; Roxboro High School, 1932; Wilson High School, 1933; Durham High School, 1934; Wilson High School, 1935; Statesville High School, 1936; Durham High School, 1937; Durham High School, 1938; Durham High School, 1939; Charlotte High School, 1940; Durham High School, 1941; Durham High School, 1942.

THE FRENCH CONTEST

Raleigh High School, 1926; Davidson High School, 1927; Forest City High School, 1928; Lenoir High School, 1929; Greensboro High School, 1930; Fayetteville High School, 1931; Louisburg High School (tie), 1932; Sylva High School (tie), 1932; Oxford High School, 1933; Louisburg High School, 1934; Louisburg High School, 1935; Louisburg High School, 1936; Albemarle High School (tie), 1937; Rockingham High School (tie), 1937; Richard J. Reynolds High School, 1938; Wakelon High School, 1939; Greensboro High School, 1940; Greensboro High School, 1941.

THE SPANISH CONTEST

Statesville High School, 1926; Statesville High School, 1927; Reidsville High School, 1928; Albemarle High School, 1929; Albemarle High School, 1930; Fayetteville High School, 1931; Gastonia High School, 1932; Gastonia High School, 1933; Gastonia High School, 1934; Gastonia High School, 1935; Gastonia High School, 1936; Rocky Mount High School, 1937; Rocky Mount High School, 1938; Gastonia High School, 1939; Broughton High School, 1940; Richard J. Reynolds High School, 1941; Reynolds High School, 1942.

THE MATHEMATICS CONTEST

Ayden High School, 1926; Charlotte High School, 1927; Ahoskie High School, 1928; Rocky Mount High School, 1929; Greensboro High School, 1930; Greensboro High School, 1931; Durham High School, 1932; Durham High School, 1933; Broughton High School, 1934; Albemarle High School, 1935; Durham High School, 1936; Charlotte High School, 1937; Broughton High School, 1938; Durham High School, 1939; Durham High School, 1940; Durham High School, 1941. Reynolds High School, 1942.

THE PHYSICS CONTEST

Sanford High School (tie), 1938; Southern Pines High School (tie), 1938; Charlotte High School, 1939; Greensboro High School, 1940; Durham High School, 1941. Durham High School, 1942.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICES

The University of North Carolina offers, through the Extension Division, the following services to the people of the State:

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION. One hundred and thirty university courses are offered by mail. These courses carry college and certification credit. High school graduates and others unable to attend college find home-study an economical and satisfactory method of continuing their education.

EXTENSION CLASS INSTRUCTION. Late afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes are organized wherever enough enrollments to cover expenses are secured. Courses of both vocational and cultural nature are offered, with college credit, if desired.

LIBRARY SERVICE. Reading courses, books, and reference materials are loaned to individuals and groups interested in the systematic study and discussion of literary, historical, social, and other subjects. There are available about fifty outlines for study suitable for women's clubs or other groups.

LECTURES. Popular and technical lectures and readings by members of the faculty are arranged for schools, clubs, and other community organizations. Lecture courses either on a particular subject or on a series of topics may be obtained. Short courses and institutes are held at the University for groups interested in intensive training and instructional programs.

DRAMATIC ARTS. Assistance is given in organization for dramatic activities, in play selection and production, and in the loan of playbooks and other library material. An annual tournament is conducted in coöperation with the Carolina Dramatic Association.

INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES. In coöperation with several University departments and state agencies, the Division conducts annual contests in debating, athletics, and academic subjects. A coaching school is held each summer for high school coaches and athletic directors.

PUBLICATIONS. *The University News Letter*, containing the results of studies made of economic and social conditions in North Carolina, is sent free to residents of the State. There are also issued annually several numbers of *The Extension Bulletin* containing information of interest to general readers.

For information concerning any of these services, write to the UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION, Chapel Hill, N. C.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA EXTENSION BULLETIN

VOL. XXII JANUARY, 1943 NO. 5

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION

ANNOUNCEMENTS OF THE BUREAU OF CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION 1943-1945

Published six times a year, July, September, October, November, January, and March, by the University of North Carolina Press. Entered as second-class matter October 19, 1921, Chapel Hill, N. C.

EXTENSION BULLETINS

Vol. IV, No. 12. *Children of Old Carolina.* Historical Pageant for Children. Ethel T. Rockwell. Price 50c.

Vol. VII. No. 9. *Special Legal Relations of Married Women in N. C. as to Property, Contracts, and Guardianships.* Mary P. Smith. Price 50c.

Vol. VIII, No. 5. *The World Court.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. IX, No. 4. *The Classification of Property for Taxation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XII, No. 5. *The Sales Tax.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XIII, No. 3. *Radio Control and Operation.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XV, No. 1. *Play Producing for Schools and Little Theatres.* Frederick H. Koch and staff members of the Carolina Playmakers. Price 50c.

Vol. XV, No. 2. *Socialization of Medicine.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XVI, No. 2. *Government Ownership and Operation of Electric Utilities.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XVI, No. 4. *Plays for Schools and Little Theatres (Revised).* Price 50c.

Vol. XVII, No. 3. *Unicameral Legislatures.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XVII, No. 4. *First Principles of Play Direction.* Samuel Selden. Price 50c.

Vol. XVIII. No. 2. *Anglo-American Alliance.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XIX, No. 2. *Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XX, No. 3. *Inter-American Relations.* Price 25c.

Vol. XXI, No. 1. *Audio-Visual Aid to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* Free.

Vol. XXI, No. 2. *Hemisphere Defense.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price, 50c.

Vol. XXII, No. 1. *Audio-Visual Aids to Schools, Colleges, Churches, and Adult Study Groups.* (Supplement). Free.

Vol. XXII, No. 2. *Federal Aid to Education.* Debate Handbook. Compiled by E. R. Rankin. Price 50c.

Vol. XXII, No. 3. *Sixth Annual N. C. School Art Exhibition.* 1942-43. (Free).

Vol. XXII, No. 4. *Academic Contests for N. C. High Schools.* Announcements for the year 1942-43. (Free).

MONEY ORDERS, CHECKS, OR STAMPS ACCEPTED
ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION,
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION

BUREAU OF CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

FRANK PORTER GRAHAM, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., D.Litt., *President.*
ROBERT BURTON HOUSE, A.M., LL.D., *Dean of Administration.*
RUSSELL MARVIN GRUMMAN, B.H., *Director.*
WILLIAM JOHN MCKEE, C.E., Ph.D., *Supervisor of Instruction.*
MARY LOUISA COBB, A.B., *Chief of Bureau of Correspondence Instruction.*
NELLIE ROBERSON, A.B., *Chief of Library Extension Service.*

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD*

DUDLEY DEWITT CARROLL, M.A., *Professor of Economics and Dean of the School of Commerce.*
WESLEY CRITZ GEORGE, Ph.D., *Professor of Histology and Embryology.*
ALLAN WILSON HOBBS, Ph.D., *Professor of Applied Mathematics and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.*
SAMUEL HUNTINGTON HOBBS, JR., Ph.D., *Professor of Rural Social-Economics.*
WILLIAM JOHN MCKEE, C.E., Ph.D., *Professor of Education in Extension Teaching and Head of the Department of In-Service Teacher Training.*
HOWARD WASHINGTON ODUM, Ph.D., *Kenan Professor of Sociology.*
WILLIAM WHATLEY PIERSON, Ph.D., *Professor of History and Political Science and Dean of the Graduate School.*
WILL CARSON RYAN, Ph.D., LL.D.,*Kenan Professor of Education.*

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTORS

RAYMOND WILLIAM ADAMS, Ph.D., *Professor of English.*
ELIZABETH DURHAM BANNER, A.B. Lib. Sc., *Assistant, Periodicals Department, U. N. C. Library.*
GLADYS ANGEL BEARD, M.A., *Assistant Professor of Health and Physical Education.*
LEE MARSHALL BROOKS, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Sociology.*
ROBERT WILLARD BROWNING, A.B., *Instructor in Philosophy.*
WILLIAM GREEN BURKS, M.A., *Instructor in Spanish.*
WALLACE EVERETT CALDWELL, Ph.D., *Professor of Ancient History.*
EDWARD JENNINGS CARTER, M.A., *Graduate Assistant in Education.*
FREDERICK EDWARD COENEN, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of German.*
SAMUEL THOMAS EMORY, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Geography.*
ALFRED GARVIN ENGSTROM, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of French.*
LOFTON LEROY GARNER, A.M., *Assistant Professor of Mathematics.*
FLETCHER MELVIN GREEN, Ph.D., *Professor of History.*
EARL HORACE HARTSELL, Ph.D., *Instructor in English.*
MILTON SIDNEY HEATH, Ph.D., *Professor of Economics.*
ERVIN PAUL HEXNER, D.Pol.Sc., J.D., *Associate Professor of Political Science.*
RICHARD JUNIUS MENDENHALL HOBBS, A.B., LL.B., *Professor of Business Law.*
SAMUEL HUNTINGTON HOBBS, JR., Ph.D., *Professor of Rural Social-Economics.*

---

* The Dean of Administration, the Registrar, and the Dean of Students are *ex officio* members of the Administrative Board.

ARTHUR PALMER HUDSON, Ph.D., *Professor of English.*
ROBERT DOUGLAS HUME, M.A., *Assistant Professor of Dramatic Art.*
JOHN ELI IVEY, JR., B.S., *Instructor in Sociology.*
WILLIAM SUMNER JENKINS, Ph.D., LL.B., *Associate Professor of Political Science.*
LOUIS OSGOOD KATTSOFF, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Philosophy.*
DONALD STANLEY KLAISS, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Sociology.*
EDGAR WALLACE KNIGHT, Ph.D., *Kenan Professor of Education.*
HELMUT KUHN, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Philosophy.*
JOHN WAYNE LASLEY, JR., Ph.D., *Professor of Pure Mathematics.*
JOSEPH MERRITT LEAR, M.A., *Associate Professor of Insurance.*
HUGH TALMADGE LEFLER, Ph.D., *Professor of History.*
WILLIAM JOHN MCKEE, C.E., Ph.D., *Professor of Education in Extension Teaching.*
HAROLD DIEDRICK MEYER, A.M., LL.D., *Professor of Sociology.*
ROY WILLIAMSON MORRISON, Ph.D., *Professor of Education.*
ALBERT RAY NEWSOME, Ph.D., *Professor of History.*
JOSEPHINA NIGGLI, M.A., *Instructor in Dramatic Art.*
ERLE EWART PEACOCK, A.B., M.B.A., C.P.A., *Professor of Accounting.*
CARL HAMILTON PEGG, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of History.*
CARLETON ESTEY PRESTON, Ph.D., *Professor of Education.*
WILLIAM FREDERICK PROUTY, Ph.D., *Professor of Stratigraphic Geology.*
CHARLES BASKERVILLE ROBSON, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Political Science.*
MARGARET ROGERS, M.S., *Instructor in Psychology.*
JOSIAH COX RUSSELL, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of History.*
WILL CARSON RYAN, Ph.D., LL.D., *Kenan Professor of Education.*
SHIPP GILLESPIE SANDERS, A.M., *Professor of Latin.*
JAN PHILIP SCHINHAN, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Music.*
ROBERT BOIES SHARPE, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of English.*
*WALTER SPEARMAN, A.M., *Assistant Professor of Journalism.*
NAN COOKE SMITH, M.A., *Graduate Assistant in Music.*
CLEMENS SOMMER, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of the History of Art.*
JAMES STERLING TIPPETT, M.A., *Member Special Staff, U. N. C. Summer School.*
PAUL WOODFORD WAGER, Ph.D., *Associate Professor of Political Science.*
W. PRESTON WARREN, Ph.D., *Visiting Professor of Philosophy.*
THEODORE RUSSELL WEISS, M.A., *Instructor in English.*
WILLIAM LESTER WILSON, A.M., *Creative English.*

---

* On leave.

LIST OF COURSES

(See pages 8 and 9 for information regarding fees.)

PAGE

Art 19

History and Appreciation of Ancient and Medieval Art

Dramatic Art 19

Shakespeare (See English)
Playwriting
Modern Drama

Economics and Commerce 19-21

General Economics
Economic History
Accounting
Business Law
Business English
The Organization and Operation of the Public Employment Service (See Political Science

Education 21-24

General Introduction to the Study of Education
Educational Psychology
The Teaching of High School English
Classroom Management
Children's Literature
Principles of Secondary Education
Methods of Secondary Education
Basic Principles and Techniques in Educational Administration
The Public School Principalship
Principles and Methods in Adult Education
Education in the South
Historic Foundations of Modern Education
Social and Educational History of the United States
Reading and Study Habits for the Elementary Grades

PAGE

The Teaching of the Natural Sciences in the Elementary Grades
Curriculum Construction
Tests and Measurements in Education
Growth and Development of the School Child
School Hygiene and Health Education
The Teaching of Arithmetic in the Elementary Grades
Language Arts in the Elementary Grades
Problems of Citizenship

English 24-26

Freshman English
Business English
English Literature (Sophomore Course)
English Literature, 1780-1830
Shakespeare
Introduction to the Short Story
Creative Writing: The Short Story
Creative Writing: The Short Story (Advanced)
American Literature
The English Novel
Modern Drama (See Dramatic Art)
Playwriting (See Dramatic Art)

Geology and Geography 26-27

Introduction to General Geology
Elementary Geography (Natural Science)
Principles of Geography
Introduction to Geography
Industrial and Commercial Geography

German 27

Intermediate German
Advanced German

PAGE

History 27-29

Social Science
American History
Ancient History
English History
North Carolina History
Social and Educational History of the United States (See Education)

Journalism 29

Writing Publicity for Clubs

Latin 29

Readings in Roman Literature
Latin Composition
Intermediate Latin
Latin Poetry

Mathematics 29-30

Introductory Mathematics
College Algebra
Plane Trigonometry
Spherical Trigonometry

Music 30-31

Elementary Theory of Music
Harmony
History of Music

Philosophy 31

Communism, Totalitarian, and Democracy
Introduction to Philosophy
Ethics
Social Ethics

PAGE

Political Science 31-32

The Government of the United States
The Governments of Europe
American State Government
The Organization and Operation of the Public Employment Service (Public Administration)

Psychology 32

General Psychology

Romance Languages 32-33

Intermediate French—Composition and Reading
Advanced French — Composition and Reading
French Literature
Spanish Composition
Spanish Literature

Sociology 33-35

Introduction to Sociology
Social Problems
The Family
Play and Recreation
Extra-Curricular Activities
Regional Sociology of the South
The Cooperative Movement
The Negro
Rural Economics
History of Agriculture
Rural Sociology
North Carolina: Economic and Social

(For courses offered at State College, Raleigh, N. C., see pp. 36-38)

CORRESPONDENCE INSTRUCTION

This catalogue explains in detail the correspondence work offered at Chapel Hill by the Extension Division of the University of North Carolina. The courses offered at the State College of Agriculture and Engineering in Raleigh are listed on pages 36-38. Full information regarding these may be secured by writing to that institution.

The courses listed herein may be pursued by any one who is prepared to study them with profit. Those who expect to secure credit towards a degree must, of course, satisfy the entrance and other requirements. However, those who do not desire or expect such credit are permitted to register for any course in which they have an interest. Non-credit students are given the same careful instruction as those who are candidates for a degree.

General Information

Correspondence study is simply a method of learning through the directed study of textbooks and supplementary material, writing the answers to the questions, and developing lines of thought contained in each assignment. Each assignment includes: (a) full directions for study, including references to textbooks by chapter and page; (b) suggestions and helps of the instructor; (c) questions to develop an understanding of the work done. When a student has registered for a course three assignments are usually sent him. He does the work outlined in the first assignment and sends his paper to the Extension Division, and then begins work on the second assignment. At the University each paper is gone over by the instructor, who carefully corrects and grades it and places on it constructive criticism and helpful suggestions for future study. Upon receipt of completed assignments, additional ones will be sent the student. While it is very desirable that the student send in work regularly, at least one assignment each week, he has the privilege of sending it in as he is able to complete it, *provided he does not submit more than four assignments a week in each course.*

Credit

Unless otherwise noted, all courses offered count toward the A.B. degree at this institution. Some courses are credited toward S.B. degrees. No courses offered count toward the master's degree.

To work out a systematic plan for taking correspondence instruction toward the A.B. degree, study carefully the *Requirements for Bachelors' Degrees* found on pages 15-16. Courses marked with an asterisk (*) are

given by correspondence. The other courses listed in this catalogue are elective.

The State Department of Public Instruction at Raleigh will, in accordance with their regulations, credit all courses listed in this catalogue (except those listed as non-credit courses) toward state teachers' certificates. See pages 9-10 regarding amount of credit allowed and distribution.

For credit toward a degree at this branch of the University, not more than the equivalent of one and one-half years of residence work, 45 semester hours or 67½ quarter hours, may be earned by extension. *Of this amount only 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours may be taken by correspondence.* One-third of the total amount, 15 semester hours or 22½ quarter hours, is the maximum of correspondence work that may be completed in any twelve-month period. It is expected that the last year's work will be taken in residence. Special cases will be handled individually.

Entrance Requirements

If degree credit is desired at this branch of the University an applicant for correspondence work must meet the University entrance requirements of at least fifteen acceptable units from an accredited high school. The high school record must be transferred to the University on a blank that will be furnished for the purpose. An applicant for advanced standing may be ranked as a sophomore, junior, or senior when credit for work taken at other colleges has been properly transferred to the University and accepted by the examining committee.

If *certification credit only* is desired, correspondence courses may be taken by any teacher who holds a Standard State Certificate.

Nature of Courses

Each correspondence course has been developed by a member of the faculty so that it parallels a course given in residence in the same subject and covers an equal amount of work for which equal credit is given. Although it may vary, a correspondence course which gives two semester hours' or three quarter hours' credit has about sixteen assignments and one which gives three and one-third semester hours' or five quarter hours' credit has about twenty-seven assignments. Each assignment covers approximately two days of residence work. On such assignments a student is expected to put approximately six hours, or else sufficient time to do the work in the best possible manner.

Fees and Refunds

Each student pays, at the time of his enrollment, a registration fee of two dollars ($2.00) which shall entitle him to administrative and office

service for one year. Unless otherwise stated, residents of North Carolina are charged a fee of eight dollars ($8.00) for a two semester hour or three quarter hour course and thirteen dollars and fifty cents ($13.50) for a three and one-third semester hour or five quarter hour course. For non-residents the fees are ten dollars ($10.00) for the former and seventeen dollars and fifty cents ($17.50) for the latter, payable at the time of enrollment.

Members of the armed forces are not charged the registration fee of $2.00 and in each case are charged only in-state course fees. For full information about the United States Armed Forces Institute, see p. 17.

No course fee or parts of such can be refunded after a course is once begun. In the event that no work has been done during the first three months and application is made within that time, a portion of the fee will be refunded, provided a good cause is given for discontinuing. A course fee holds good for one year and five weeks only. If it is desired to continue a course not completed within that time, a renewal fee of two dollars ($2.00) for a two semester hour or three quarter hour course and three dollars ($3.00) for each three and one-third semester hour or five quarter course will be required in order to extend the time for six months.

Books and Supplies

Textbooks are purchased by the students themselves, usually through the Extension Division. When a student has finished a course the Division will repurchase books that are in good condition if the student desires to sell them, provided the course has not been discontinued or revised and the Division is not sufficiently stocked.

Upon application, reference books for supplementary reading may be borrowed from the University Library Extension Service at a slight expense to the student for postage and packing. In some instances supplementary texts may be rented from the Bureau of Correspondence Instruction.

Light-weight paper suitable for typewriter or pen may be purchased from the Bureau. This is recommended in order to save postage.

Rules Governing Correspondence Work

1. Not more than two enrollments may be had at one time, and it is advisable to complete one course before registering for another.

2. Students may enroll for correspondence work at any time during the year.

3. Work taken by correspondence must be completed within one year and five weeks from the date of registration or a renewal fee will be required.

4. Those who wish credit must take a final examination on completion of all assignments in a course. This may be taken either at the University or in the student's community under conditions approved by the University. It should be taken no later than one month after the last assignment has

been returned corrected. The examination must be passed if credit is to be allowed.

5. It is desirable that students send in at least one assignment a week. *Only four assignments per week are accepted in a course.*

6. A subject previously taken in any institution for which either degree or certification credit has already been given cannot be taken for credit by correspondence.

7. For credit toward a degree at this branch of the University, not more than the equivalent of one and one-half years of residence work, which is 45 semester hours or 67½ quarter hours, may be earned by extension. *Only 30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours may be taken by correspondence.* One-third of the total amount, 15 semester hours or 22½ quarter hours, is the maximum of correspondence work that may be completed in any twelve-month period. It is expected that the last year's work will be taken in residence. Special cases will be handled individually.

8. Correspondence work cannot be taken at the same time residence work is being taken without special permission from the student's dean.

9. Persons who are not *bona fide* residents of Chapel Hill must secure the approval of University authorities to remain in town and take correspondence courses.

10. When a student has completed a correspondence course all assignments must be returned to the Extension Division before a final grade or credit will be given.

11. It is expected that students will not take work from more than one institution at a time.

Standards

The Bureau emphasizes the importance of the individual guidance of students by instructors. This involves the evaluation of students' work and the giving of helpful suggestions according to individual needs.

All students will be expected to submit their assignments in good form, grammatical and otherwise, acceptable to the instructor and in line with the requirements of the University. If an instructor in any department finds that the English composition of a student is below the standard, the symbol *cc* (composition condition) may accompany the final grade, as for instance Bcc, Ccc, or Dcc. This will indicate that, although the instructor has accepted as satisfactory the student's knowledge of the subject matter of the course, the penmanship, punctuation, spelling, vocabulary, or organization of the written work is not up to the University standard. A student receiving such a grade may remove the condition by doing work in residence assigned by the English Department or by completing successfully either of the correspondence courses English c1 or English c51.

The Honor System

Correspondence courses, like residence courses, are on the honor basis. The student body of the University has through a century of traditions developed an honor spirit and an honor system. A student who plagiarizes, copies, cheats, or in any way does dishonest work is not only denied credit for the course but is also dismissed from the University by his fellow students. Work must be honest above all other qualities. Each correspondence student is on his honor to do only honest work.

To make certain that there is no semblance of dishonor it should be an unfailing habit *never* to use the textbook or any other materials or aids when writing answers to questions.

No credit will be given for a course in case the student has been false to the pledge of honor. No refund will be made in such case.

Transferring Credit

A record of the extension work completed towards a degree will be transferred to another institution when this request is made by the student.

The University cannot determine the policy of other institutions in regard to accepting towards their degrees credit for work completed in extension elsewhere. There are very few standard colleges or universities at this time, however, that do not accept credit for work completed through extension instruction in other standard colleges or universities. There is usually an interchange of credits between the various institutions which are members of the National University Extension Association.

The Extension Division will transfer credit to the State Department of Public Instruction to be applied toward teachers' certificates on the dates nearest the completion of the work. The State Department has requested the Division to transfer credit for this purpose at only two stated times during the year—June 1st and September 1st. Unless the work is completed before September 1st, credit will not be allowed by the State Department as of the June preceding but will be carried forward to the June next succeeding.

Special Notices to Teachers

Teachers who need *professional courses* must be sure to choose them in their own professional field. For instance, a primary teacher should not take a course in high school methods.

For renewing a certificate, six semester hours' work is required and may be taken by correspondence and/or extension class. Any courses which do not duplicate courses previously taken and are not methods courses outside the field of the certificate will be suitable.

The following regulations have been adopted by the State Department of Public Instruction:

1. No teacher in service shall be given credit for more than twenty semester hours during any one year between September 1st of that year and August 31st of the following year, a teacher in service being defined as one who teaches six or more months during the period. This, it must be understood, is the maximum total credit from all sources.

2. No teacher in service shall be given credit for more than twelve semester hours of extension class teaching or correspondence study instruction in any year between September 1st of that year and August 31st of the following year, with not more than eight semester hours permitted between September 1st and June 1st following.

3. Not more than forty per cent of the credit necessary to raise a certificate from one class to another may be earned through extension class teaching and/or correspondence study instruction.

4. The original professional credit necessary for an administrative or supervisory certificate may not be secured through extension class teaching and/or correspondence study instruction. The requirements for Graduate Secondary and Elementary Certificates, issued on the basis of a master's degree, may not be met by correspondence study.

5. Not more than sixteen semester hours' extension credit may be earned with the same instructor.

The requirements for A Certificates, as outlined by the State Department of Public Instruction, are as follows:

High School Teachers' A Certificates

The minimum scholastic training represents graduation from a standard four-year college. It is desirable that one be qualified to teach two or more subjects.

I. The professional requirements common to all certificates are:
   1. Educational Psychology ..... 2 S. H.
   2. Principles of High School Teaching
      or
      Problems in Secondary Education ..... 2 S. H.
   3. Materials and Methods in One Subject Field ..... 2 S. H.
   4. Observation and Directed Teaching ..... 3 S. H.
   5. Electives ..... 9 S. H.

II. The academic requirement varies with the subject for which certification is granted. The minimum subject-matter credit for the teaching of any subject shall be:

For English ..... 24 S.H.
This shall include:
   a. Grammar, Composition and Rhetoric
   b. American Literature
   c. English Literature

For Latin ..... 24 S.H.
Based on two units of high school Latin, to be reduced six semester

For French ..... 18 S.H.
Based on two or more units of high school French, otherwise ... 24 S.H.
(The quantitative requirements for teaching any other modern foreign language shall be the same as for French.)

For Social Studies ..... 30 S.H.
   a. American History ..... 6 S.H.

hours for each additional unit of entrance credit.

For Library Science

A. Librarian (Whole-time) 24 S.H.
This shall include:
a. Administration
b. Cataloging and Classification
c. Reference
d. Children's and Adolescent Literature

B. Teacher-Librarian (Part-time) ..... 12 S.H.
This shall include:
a. Administration
b. Reference
c. Children's and Adolescent Literature

For Mathematics ..... 15 S.H.
For Industrial Arts ..... 30 S.H.
For Bible ..... 15 S.H.
For Fine Arts ..... 30 S.H.
For Home Economics ..... 51 S.H.
a. Chemistry ..... 6 S.H.
b. Biology ..... 6 S.H.
c. Physics ..... 2 S.H.
d. Art ..... 3 S.H.
e. Foods ..... 8 S.H.
f. Clothing ..... 8 S.H.
g. Management ..... 6 S.H.
Home Management Residence required (6 weeks recommended as a minimum). Other courses may include buying, furnishing, and housing.
h. Family ..... 6 S.H.
Child Development (required). Family Relationships (required). Other courses may include Health, Nursing and Hygiene.
i. Social Science ..... 6 S.H.

For Commerce ..... 30 S.H.
This shall include:
a. Stenography
b. Typewriting
c. Bookkeeping
d. Office Management

(Individual certification will be granted in any one of the specific areas, a, b, and c, in which 9 semester hours' credit is presented.)

For Agriculture

B.S. Degree in Agricultural Education, including professional credits outlined for the teachers of other high school subjects.

For Public School Music ..... 30 S.H.
3 semester hours in courses requiring singing may be substituted for credit

b. European History ..... 6 S.H.
c. From Government, Geography, Economics or Sociology 9 S.H.
d. Electives (from a, b, c) 9 S.H.

(Individual certification will be granted in any of the specific areas: history, government, geography, economics and sociology, in which 12 semester hours' credit is presented. Certification for Citizenship or Civics or Problems in American Democracy would require credit for at least 18 semester hours from government, economics and sociology.)

For Science ..... 30 S.H.
This shall include:
a. Biology ..... 6 S.H.
b. Chemistry ..... 6 S.H.
c. Physics ..... 6 S.H.
d. Geography or Geology 3 S.H.
e. Electives from a, b, c, or d ..... 9 S.H.

(Individual certification will be granted in any of the specific areas a, b, c, or d, in which 12 semester hours' credit is presented. Certification for the subject of *General Science* will require credit for 18 semester hours from three of the four areas a, b, c and d.)

For Physical Education ..... 30 S.H.
(Full-time teacher of Health and Physical Education in the Junior and Senior High School)
This shall include:*
a. Human anatomy and physiology ..... 6 S.H.
b. Principles, Organization, Administration, Supervision of Physical Education and Health Education ... 3-4 S.H.
c. Physical Education skills and applied techniques** (games, rhythms, gymnastics and aquatics) ..... 12 S.H.
d. Individual corrective physical education ..... 2-3 S.H.
e. Health Education:
1. Methods and Materials in Health Education ..... 2-3 S.H.
2. Personal hygiene and public health ..... 3-4 S.H.

(Part-time teacher of Health and Physical Education and Coaches of Athletic Teams) ..... 15 S.H.
This shall include:
a. Principles, Organization, Ad-

* 6-8 semester hours of biological and physical sciences and 6-8 semester hours of social sciences are recommended as prerequisites.

** Required service courses in health and physical education are not acceptable for credit toward certification in these fields.

in Voice. Since the Public School Music Certificate may be and is used in the elementary school, it is strongly recommended that the professional courses include child psychology, techniques and methods in the elementary school, etc.

ministration, and Supervision of Physical Education & Health ..... 3-4 S.H.
b. Physical Education skills and applied techniques* (games, rhythms, gymnastics & aquatics) 8-9 S.H.
c. Health Education, including the teaching of health and school health problems ..... 3-4 S.H.

Primary A and Grammar Grade A Certificates

These certificates require graduation from a standard four-year college. As a part of the work, or in addition to it, the applicant shall have:

For Primary A Certificate

1. English ..... 12 S.H.
   a. Composition ..... 6 S.H.
   b. Children's Literature (Primary Grades) 2 S.H.
   c. Elective ..... 4 S.H.
2. American History & Citizenship ..... 6 S.H.
3. Geography, including Nature Study ..... 6 S.H.
4. Fine and Industrial Arts 9 S.H.
   This shall include:
   a. Drawing
   b. Industrial Arts
   c. Music
5. Physical & Health Education ..... 6 S.H.
   This shall include a minimum of:
   a. Principles of Health and Physical Education ... 2 S.H.
   b. Practices and Procedures in Physical Education for Elementary Schools... 2 S.H.
   c. Practices and Procedures in Health for Elementary Schools ..... 2 S.H.
   (Two semester hours of Biological Science are recommended as a prerequisite.)
6. Education ..... 21 S.H.
   (Exclusive of General Psychology)
   This shall include:
   a. Primary Methods (Reading, Language, Numbers)
   b. Classroom Management
   c. Child Study
   d. Educational Psychology
   e. Observation & Directed Teaching
7. Electives ..... 60 S.H.

For Grammar Grade A Certificate

1. English ..... 12 S.H.
   a. Composition ..... 6 S.H.
   b. Children's Literature (Intermediate & Grammar Grade) 2 S.H.
   c. Elective ..... 4 S.H.
2. American History & Citizenship ..... 6 S.H.
3. Geography ..... 6 S.H.
4. Fine and Industrial Arts 9 S.H.
   This shall include:
   a. Drawing
   b. Industrial Arts
   c. Music
5. Physical & Health Education ..... 6 S.H.
   This shall include a minimum of:
   a. Principles of Health and Physical Education ..... 2 S.H.
   b. Practices and Procedures in Physical Education for Elementary Schools ... 2 S.H.
   c. Practices and Procedures in Health for Elementary Schools ..... 2 S.H.
   (Two semester hours of Biological Science are recommended as a prerequisite.)
6. Education ..... 21 S.H.
   (Exclusive of General Psychology)
   This shall include:
   a. Grammar Grade Methods (Reading, Language, Arithmetic, Social Science)
   b. Classroom Management
   c. Child Study
   d. Educational Psychology
   e. Educational Measurements
   f. Observation & Directed Teaching
7. Electives ..... 60 S.H.

* Required service courses in health and physical education are not acceptable for credit toward certification in these fields.

In the Observation and Directed Teaching one shall have had not fewer than 30 semester hours of actual class teaching or not fewer than 30 full class exercises.

Before any certificate will be issued for teaching in the elementary schools, the records from the institution in which the applicant received training must show a satisfactory stage of proficiency in Penmanship and Spelling.

VALIDITY AND RENEWAL. A Class A Certificate may be renewed for five years by presenting credit for 6 semester hours of work. A Class A Certificate issued in 1930 or prior thereto may be made a Life Certificate by presenting credit for five years' teaching experience on the Class A Certificate and credit for 6 semester hours' work specializing in Methods and Supervision. Primary, grammar grade and high school teachers should take methods courses in their respective fields.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELORS' DEGREES

The matter below, taken from the University catalog, is inserted so that correspondence students may select their courses in line with the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, should they desire to do so. The course leading to this degree is designed to provide a general, well-rounded, liberal education. The amount of correspondence work accepted for degree credit is explained on p. 10. Students who plan to take Music as their major subject should consult the University's General Catalog for information concerning their programs for the freshman and sophomore years. Those interested in other bachelors' degrees should likewise be guided by the University Catalog.

In order to be recommended for the degree a student must pass satisfactorily and in accordance with the qualitative standard in force the work prescribed for the lower division and at least ninety (90) quarter hours in the upper division, including the prescribed subjects listed below and elective subjects in accordance with the requirements stated. At least three quarters within twelve months must be spent in residence before a degree will be granted.

In his first two years the student pursues a more or less definite curriculum, according to the following plan:

(For the A.B. degree)

Freshman Year

Required:
- *English 1-2-3
- *Social Science 1-2-3
- Physical Education 1-2-3
- Hygiene 1-2-3

Choose one:
- *Mathematics 1-2-3 or *7-8
- Greek 11-12-13
- **Latin 11-12-13 or 21-22-23

Choose one:
- Natural Science 1-2-3
- Chemistry 1-2-3
- Physics 1-2-3
- †Geology 21-22-23

Choose one:
- French 11-12-13
- *German 11-12-13
- Greek 11-12-13
- **Latin 11-12-13 or 21-22-23
- Spanish 11-12-13

---

* Given by correspondence.
** Latin c 11 only offered.
† Geology c 41-42 will meet this requirement.

Sophomore Year

Required:
- *English 22-23-24
- Foreign Language, 21-22-23 (Continuing the one chosen in the first year.)

Choose one:
- *Economics 31-32
- Education 41-42
- Political Science 31-32-33
- *History 21-22-23 or *71-72
- ‡History 41-42
- *History 44-45-46
- Philosophy 21-22-23
- §Sociology 21-22-23

Choose one:
- Botany 41 and Zoology 41
- Botany 41 and 43
- Chemistry 1-2-3 or 4-5, or 31 and 41 (or 42)
- Geology 21-22-23 or *41-42
- Physics 21-22-23 or 24-25
- Mathematics 21-22-23
- **Psychology 21-22-23 or 24-25
- Zoology 41 and 42

In addition choose one free elective—3 hours a week for the year.

Junior and Senior Years

For the purpose of providing the proper concentration for the junior and senior years the subjects of the curriculum have been grouped under three Divisions: the Division of the Humanities, the Division of Natural Science and the Division of Social Science. The Division of Teacher Training, under the direction of the head of the University's Department of Education, has been organized for the purposes of administration, guidance, and program-making in the field of teacher training. At the end of a student's second year he must choose one of the Divisions for his major work during his last two years. Having made his choice his work will be directed by the Chairman of the Division chosen. In general he will be expected to take about one-third of his work in one Department, one-third in allied Departments in the same Division, and one-third elective in other Divisions. It is understood that if no program of a Division meets the needs of a student he may submit a program of his own, which he may follow if it meets with the approval of the Division chosen for his major work.

It is expected that the last year's work will be taken in residence. Special cases will be handled individually.

NOTE: Persons interested in fulfilling the requirements for a teacher's certificate should refer to pages 11-15, inclusive.

---

* Given by correspondence.
** Credit only for lecture part of course.
‡ History 41 only offered.
§ Sociology c 51-52 will meet this requirement.

The United States Armed Forces Institute

The University of North Carolina is one of a group of colleges and universities selected by the United States Government to offer correspondence courses to those in service, the Government paying part of the expense. Enlisted persons in the U. S. Army with four months' service and personnel of the U. S. Navy, U. S. Coast Guard and U. S. Marine Corps who have been in active service for not less than two months are eligible to enroll under the Institute plan, provided they take courses approved by the War Department. The following subjects are included in the University's approved courses: Commerce, Economics, Education, English, French, Geology, Geography, German, History, Mathematics, Political Science, Public Administration, Psychology, Rural Social Economics, Sociology and Spanish. Full information will be sent upon request. The Government will pay half the cost of texts and tuition fees not to exceed $20.00 for any one course on the approved list. Members of the armed forces are not charged the usual registration fee of $2.00 (see p. 8) and in each case are charged only in-state course fees (see p. 9).

Those desiring to enroll under this plan should send to the Commandant of The Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wisconsin (1) one of the application blanks in the back of this catalog with an Institute application blank on which is a statement of the organization commander's approval and (2) a money order, cashier's check or certified check made out to the Treasurer of this University for the student's share of the cost (one-half the combined fee for the tuition and texts). If the Armed Forces Institute application forms cannot be secured from a post, camp or station commander, they may be obtained from the Institute headquarters, Madison, Wisconsin.

Adult Education

Special arrangements will be made with instructors to meet the requirements of adult students who, for various reasons, desire to continue studying. Any mature person or group of persons, regardless of previous education, may register for any of the subjects listed in this bulletin, and the instructor will endeavor to adjust the course to the individual needs and interests. Courses in Psychology, Education, Art, Economics, Rural Economics, and Sociology are especially recommended for home-makers, social workers, parents and teachers. Literary and civic club members will find courses in History, Economics, English, Political Science, foreign languages, Journalism, Art and Music valuable. For those in business there are courses in Accounting, Business English, Business Law, Mathematics, etc.

How to Select and Register for Correspondence Work

Read carefully all the preceding pages. Then look through the list of courses and select one or two which you need or in which you are most interested. Next fill out the application blank in the back of this bulletin;

detach and mail it with a check or money order to the University Extension Division, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Before writing to the Division be sure to fill out *every line* of the application blank. If you are a school teacher, be certain to give exact information, where called for, concerning your teacher's certificate; i.e., *kind* (whether elementary, primary, grammar grade, or high school); *class* (whether A, B, or C); and *number*.

Textbooks will not be sent unless requested on the application blank.

COURSES OF INSTRUCTION

NOTE: Unless otherwise stated in the description of the courses, the "c" numbers are the same as in the University catalogue and also correspond to the "s" numbers in the summer school catalogue. For the complete understanding of a course, both the "a" and "b" parts should be taken. For degree credit both parts are required.

NOTE: The fees here listed apply to residents of North Carolina. Fees for non-residents are $10.00 for a half course and $17.50 for a whole course. *In addition* to the course fee, each student (resident and non-resident) must pay at the time of his enrollment one registration fee of $2.00 which shall entitle him to administrative and office service for one year. (See pp. 8-9.) For special rates for members of the armed forces, see p. 9.

DEPARTMENT OF ART

c41.
THE HISTORY AND APPRECIATION OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL ART.
PROFESSOR SOMMER AND ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarters hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A survey of the architecture, sculpture, and painting from the beginnings of art through the Gothic period.

DEPARTMENT OF DRAMATIC ART

c50.
SHAKESPEARE.
(See description of this course listed under Department of English.)

c155a.
PLAYWRITING.
MISS NIGGLI
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarters hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A practical course in the analysis of the one-act play with emphasis upon technical devices for achieving dramatic effects.

c155b.
PLAYWRITING.
MISS NIGGLI
Prerequisite, Dramatic Art c155a.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarters hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A practical course in the writing of the one-act play (or the short pageant).

c162a-162b.
MODERN DRAMA.
PROFESSOR HUME.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments each.

The main purpose of this course is to give the student a general acquaintance with the chief tendencies of the English and continental drama of the past forty or forty-five years.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND COMMERCE

ECONOMICS

*c21-c22-c23.
GENERAL ECONOMICS.
PROFESSOR LEAR.
Sophomore Elective.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
18 assignments each.

These courses are planned to give a general understanding of the organization of our economic life and the fundamental principles underlying it.

* Degree candidates who have not begun the study of General Economics should take Economics c 31.

c31-c32.
GENERAL ECONOMICS.
PROFESSOR LEAR.
Sophomore Elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.
These courses cover the same material as Economics c21-c22-c23. Persons who have taken Economics c21-c22-c23 should not take these.

c135.
ECONOMIC HISTORY.
PROFESSOR HEATH.
Sophomore and Junior Elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.
This course concerns a study of the development of the modern economic system, especially in Europe and America.

*COMMERCE

c1a.
ACCOUNTING.
PROFESSOR PEACOCK AND ASSISTANT.
No credit.
Fee, $8.00.
15 assignments.
Study of the fundamental principles of double entry bookkeeping; books of original entry; the ledger; preparation of financial statements.

c1b.
ACCOUNTING.
PROFESSOR PEACOCK AND ASSISTANT.
No credit.
Fee, $8.00.
15 assignments.
Continuation of c1a; closing and adjusting the books; the work sheet; control accounts; the partnership.

c91-c92.
BUSINESS LAW.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.
Prerequisites, Economics 31-32 (or 21-22-23) if taken for credit.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.
The aim of the course is to give the student an understanding of the main principles of law that govern in the daily conduct of business. The topics discussed are: contracts, agencies, negotiable instruments, sales, bailments, corporations, partnerships, and bankruptcy.

ALLIED SUBJECTS

†c6.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
(See description of this course listed under Department of English.)

c51.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
(See description of this course listed under Department of English.)

* NOTE: Credit courses listed under the Department of Commerce count only toward the S.B. degree in Commerce.

† Persons working for the S.B. degree in Commerce should take English c51 instead of this course.

cn1.
THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE. (Public Administration.)
(See description of this course listed under Department of Political Science.)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

*c41.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR RYAN.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.
This is an orientation course in education designed to obtain a general understanding of the philosophy and procedures of modern education with special reference to recent developments in this field.

c71a-c71b.
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY.
PROFESSOR JORDAN.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments each.
The critical consideration of such topics as original nature of man, heredity versus environment, kinds of learning, and factors influencing learning, individual differences, mental hygiene, and mental measurement.

c81.
THE TEACHING OF HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH.
PROFESSOR HARTSELL
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50
27 assignments.
This course is designed to help prospective teachers of English, as well as teachers in service, to work toward an adequate understanding of basic principles and to formulate a practical methodology consistent with such principles.

c94a-c94b.
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.
A course for teachers on the organization and direction of activities in the classroom. Class routine, lesson planning, conduct of the recitation, and extra-curricular activities will be included.

c97a-c97b.
CHILDREN'S LITERATURE.
MRS. BANNER.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.
In general, the aim of the course is to acquaint the students with children's reading in order that they may understand the varying appeals that books make to children and thus learn to select books with consideration for the different age groups and differing backgrounds of children.

c99a.
PRINCIPLES OF SECONDARY EDUCATION.
MR. CARTER
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.
This course emphasizes theory, objectives and types of organization of secondary education, the curriculum as related to aims of secondary education and modern American life and guidance in the secondary school.

* Not offered 1943.

c99b.
METHODS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION.
MR. CARTER
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

Modern methods of teaching and measuring results of teaching in secondary schools, extra-curricular activities, classroom management and procedures are stressed.

c101a-c101b.
BASIC PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION.
PROFESSOR ROSENSTENGEL.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments each.

The first half of this course will include the basic principles involved in school administration. Attention will be given to the organization, administration, and financial support of public schools in federal, state, and local school districts; work of school boards, retirement and tenure, professional ethics; public relations; and relationships of the teacher in modern educational administration. The second half of the course will deal with practical techniques in educational administration.

c102a-c102b.
THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The first half of this course considers those problems of the public school principal that have to do with the organization and administration of a school, and with the supervision of the school plant and equipment. The second part concerns those problems of the public school principal that have to do with the improvement of instruction and of the course of study.

c130.
PRINCIPLES AND METHODS IN ADULT EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR MCKEE.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

Consideration will be given in this course to (1) principles in organizing adult study groups; (2) how adults learn, (3) guidance and counselling of adults; (4) preparing curriculum materials for adult groups; and (5) teaching and learning methods and techniques in adult education.

c141.
EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH.
PROFESSOR KNIGHT OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
25 assignments.

This course gives a historical survey of education in the Southern states with special attention to its development, organization, administration, and supervision since 1876.

c142a-c142b.
HISTORIC FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR KNIGHT OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

This course traces the development of some of the more important educational problems of modern times as they have been affected by the social and political facts of history, by the contributions of the leading educational theorists, and by institutional practice.

c143a-c143b.
SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.
PROFESSOR KNIGHT OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

The purpose of this course is to present the evolution of the educational practices and institutions of the United States. These will be traced through (a) the period of transplanting of European institutions; (b) the period of modification of institutional life to meet new conditions; and (c) the period of development of an educational system of free schools in harmony with the political and social ideals and institutions of America.

NOTE: This course is accepted as the equivalent of History 170.

c152b.
READING AND STUDY HABITS FOR THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR TIPPETT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

This course considers the place of reading and study in the school program, the way teachers may provide for the maximum development of each pupil through making available desirable reading material and the remedial measures needed to meet reading and study difficulties.

c155.
THE TEACHING OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR PRESTON.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

The informational content of science is studied in relation to science instruction in the elementary school. Purposes, methods, and materials for such instruction are surveyed. Stress is laid on making the best use of common things at hand, in demonstrating and experimenting.

c160a.
CURRICULUM CONSTRUCTION.
PROFESSOR TIPPETT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

The general principles and techniques of curriculum construction on both elementary and secondary school levels comprise the major part of the course. Special attention will be focused upon recent trends in curriculum revision and organization in modern schools.

c164.
TESTS AND MEASUREMENTS IN EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR MORRISON.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
17 assignments.

Methods of measuring and improving the results of instruction in the elementary or high school are given detailed consideration. Students will be made acquainted with the most important tests and scales and will be given some experience in interpreting the results both statistically and practically.

c171a-c171b.
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHOOL CHILD.
PROFESSOR JORDAN OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

(a) Child development. A study of the growth and development of children up to the time of adolescence. Changes in emotions are emphasized as well as those of intellect. (b) Adolescence. A study of the changes in emotions, attitudes and interests which take place during the adolescent years.

ADDITIONAL COURSES

Education

*c3X.
SCHOOL HYGIENE AND HEALTH EDUCATION.
PROFESSOR BEARD.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

The elements of normal growth, physical diagnosis, and the essentials of personal health maintenance are studied. The individual child and his environment, posture, neuro-muscular coordination, physical defects, and several phases of personal and school hygiene are considered.

*c54Pa, c55Ga.
THE TEACHING OF ARITHMETIC IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR MCKEE OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

These courses deal with the organization and selection of subject matter in arithmetic together with modern methods of teaching this subject in the elementary school.

*c55Gb.
LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES.
PROFESSOR MCKEE OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A study will be made of (a) various vocabulary studies, (b) how to encourage pupils to make use of words learned, and (c) how best to measure the results of teaching.

Social Science

*c1Xa.
PROBLEMS OF CITIZENSHIP.
PROFESSOR MCKEE OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

Emphasis is on the development of those capacities and attitudes desirable in trained and creative citizens. The interrelations of home, school, community, state and national government are studied.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

c1-c2-c3.
FRESHMAN ENGLISH.
DR. HARTSELL AND MR. WEISS.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

English c1 consists of intensive reading of prose selections. The course has for its object the mastery of the sentence and the relation of sentence structure to paragraph structure. There are further readings and exercises in English c2 with attention centered upon the paragraph and its place in the longer essay. Word study and vocabulary building are integral parts of the course. English c3 is devoted to a study of the essay as a prose form; composition centers upon the writing of longer essays, letters, and expositions. Extensive reading is introduced and an approach to the problems of the study of literature is undertaken.

c6.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
DR. HARTSELL.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
17 assignments.

This course is similar to English c51. Students should not take both courses.

* This course is no longer required for a degree at this University but it may be taken for credit on teachers' certificates or for degree credit elsewhere, with the approval of the authorities.

c22-c23-c24.
ENGLISH LITERATURE.
DR. HARTSELL, Eng. c22-c23;
PROFESSOR SHARPE, Eng. c24.
Prerequisite, English 1-2-3.
Sophomore requirement.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
18 assignments, c22.
20 assignments, c23.
17 assignments, c24.

An introduction to English literature through the study of representative works of selected chief writers. The selections studied in English c22 are drawn from the beginnings of English literature through the eighteenth century. Those in English c23 are drawn from the beginnings of Romanticism through the nineteenth century. In English c24 short stories are studied.

c50.
SHAKESPEARE.
PROFESSOR SHARPE.
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarters hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A study of Shakespeare's plays. About twenty representative comedies, tragedies, and histories will be studied.

c51.
BUSINESS ENGLISH.
DR. HARTSELL.
Prerequisite, English 1-2-3.
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A course in the vocabulary, forms, and literature of the business profession with special attention to letters of application and inquiry; routine, collection, adjustment and sales letters, business reports, and technical articles. Specimen letters are studied and criticized and actual business problems solved through written work.

c53.
CREATIVE WRITING:
THE SHORT STORY.
MR. WILSON OR ASSISTANT.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A composition course designed primarily to offer to students an opportunity for short story writing and to familiarize them with the form. The work of various European and American authors will be studied.
NOTE: Those who have not had a course equivalent to English c54a are advised to take that course first.

c54a.
INTRODUCTION TO THE SHORT STORY.
PROFESSOR SHARPE.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
17 assignments.

An analysis of numerous short story materials and techniques. Introductory to English c53.
NOTE: This course was formerly called English c9.

c54.
CREATIVE WRITING.
THE SHORT STORY (Advanced).
Prerequisite, English c53 or the equivalent.
MR. WILSON OR ASSISTANT.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

The major aim of this course is to discover and develop the creative writing abilities of students in the planning and preparing of short stories.

c81. AMERICAN LITERATURE.
PROFESSOR ADAMS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course concerns a study of the Colonial and Revolutionary periods and of the early 19th century through Hawthorne and Poe.

c84. ENGLISH LITERATURE, 1780-1830.
PROFESSOR HUDSON.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A course in the literature of the English Romantic Period, the purpose of which is to acquaint the student with the best thought and feeling of the time. Especial attention is given to the greater poets, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Scott, Byron, Shelley, and Keats.

c91. THE ENGLISH NOVEL.
PROFESSOR SHARPE.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This is a course in the development of the English novel, particularly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Special attention is given to the works of Jane Austen, Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, Charlotte Brontë, and George Eliot.

c155a-c155b.
PLAYWRITING.
(See description of these courses listed under Department of Dramatic Art.)

c162a-c162b.
MODERN DRAMA.
(See description of these courses listed under Department of Dramatic Art.)

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY

Geology

c41-c42. INTRODUCTION TO GENERAL GEOLOGY.
PROFESSOR PROUTY.
Sophomore, junior, and senior electives.
Credit, 4 semester hrs. or 6 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
Lab. fee, $1.00 each.
27 assignments each.

c41. Dynamical Geology. This course deals with the physical and dynamical geology of the earth.

c42. Historical Geology. A broad study of the geological history of the earth and its inhabitants, as revealed chiefly in earth records. A scientific and cultural course. Laboratory materials used in these courses will be furnished by the Extension Division.

Geography

c3c. (Natural Science 3c). ELEMENTARY GEOGRAPHY.
Freshman requirement for those expecting to go into the School of Commerce.
PROFESSOR EMORY.
Credit, 2 2/3 semester hrs. or 4 quarter hrs.
Fee*
20 assignments.

This course gives a brief survey of earth materials for an understanding of the location and occurrence of important natural resources and their influence on economic life.

* The fee for residents is $10.75 and that for non-residents $13.00, in addition to the registration fee. See page 8.

c15a-c15b.
PRINCIPLES OF GEOGRAPHY.
PROFESSOR EMORY.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

This is an introductory course in college geography in which the interrelationship of man and his geographic environment are studied.

c31.
INTRODUCTION TO GEOGRAPHY.
PROFESSOR EMORY.
Credit, 2 2/3 semester hrs. or 4 quarter hrs.
Fee*
20 assignments.

This course, primarily for freshmen and sophomores, is a part of the basic course in Elementary Geography (Geography 31-32-33). It is a regional study of the principles underlying the climate, relief, native vegetation, soils, and distribution of minerals and metals of the world.

c51, c52.
INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY.
PROFESSOR EMORY.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
26 assignments each.

The course deals with man's interaction with his varying environment in the development of industries, and with the geographic conditions of different countries as giving rise to commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

c3-c4.
GERMAN: INTERMEDIATE COURSE.
PROFESSOR COENEN OR ASSISTANT.
Freshman and sophomore elective.
Prerequisite, one full year of German.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.

Translation, sight reading, composition and grammar.

c11-c12-c13.
GERMAN: INTERMEDIATE COURSE.
PROFESSOR COENEN OR ASSISTANT.
Freshman and sophomore elective.
Prerequisite, one full year of German.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
18 assignments each.

Practically the same material is covered in these courses as in c3-c4. Students may not take both for credit.

c21.
ADVANCED GERMAN. (Introduction to the history of German literature.)
PROFESSOR COENEN OR ASSISTANT.
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Prerequisites, German 3-4 or one year of college German.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

Lessing: *Minna von Barnhelm;* Schiller: *Die Jungfrau von Orleans.*

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

c1-c2-c3.
SOCIAL SCIENCE.
PROFESSOR PEGG.
Required of Freshmen.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
17 assignments each.

A general course dealing with the fundamental factors in modern

* The fee for residents is $10.75 and that for non-residents $13.00, in addition to the registration fee. See page 8.

civilization in Europe and the United States. An historical study of the institutions of western civilization, designed to promote an understanding of the social, political, and economic aspects of the modern world.

c21-c22-c23.
AMERICAN HISTORY.
PROFESSOR GREEN.
Sophomore elective.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
19 assignments, c21.
18 assignments, c22.
17 assignments, c23.

A general survey of the history of the United States. The first course carries the story from Columbus's discovery of America to about 1843, the second from this point to 1897 and the third covers approximately the last four decades.

NOTE: These courses were formerly called History c47-c48-c49.

c41.
ANCIENT HISTORY.
PROFESSOR CALDWELL.
Sophomore, Junior, and Senior elective.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A course dealing with the history of the Orient, Greece, and Rome to the time of Constantine. Particular attention will be paid to social and economic conditions, and cultural and religious developments.

c44-c45-c46.
ENGLISH HISTORY.
PROFESSOR RUSSELL.
Sophomore Elective.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

A survey of English history is made in these courses, History c44 concerning the period from early times to the Lancestrian Revolution, 1399; History c45 carrying the study on from then until the end of the Stuart Period, 1718; History c46 continuing until about 1935.

c71-c72.
AMERICAN HISTORY.
PROFESSOR GREEN.
Junior-senior elective.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.

A general survey of the history of the United States. The first course begins with Columbus's discovery of America and goes to the end of the Civil War; the second begins at this point and ends in the mid-nineteen-thirties. Both c21-c22-c23 and c71-c72 may not be taken for credit.

NOTE: These courses were formerly called History c47-c48.

c161.
NORTH CAROLINA, 1584-1815.
PROFESSOR LEFLER.
Junior-senior elective.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A survey of the political, social, economic and cultural development of North Carolina from the first settlement until 1815.

c162.
NORTH CAROLINA, 1815-1936.
PROFESSOR NEWSOME.
Junior-senior elective.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A survey of political, economic, social and cultural development in North Carolina since 1815.

c170a-c170b.
SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES.
(See description of these courses listed under Department of Education.)
NOTE: Those who have taken Education c37a-b or c143a-b in previous years should not take these courses.

DEPARTMENT OF JOURNALISM

*c1. Non-credit.
WRITING PUBLICITY FOR CLUBS. *10 assignments.*
PROFESSOR SPEARMAN.
This course is especially designed for club and other organization press chairmen who wish to secure newspaper publicity for their group activities.

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN

c1x. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
READINGS IN ROMAN LITERATURE. Fee, $13.50.
PROFESSOR SANDERS. *25 assignments.*
This course is concerned with the translating of Latin, with work in vocabulary, and with a review of the principles of grammar.

c8. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
LATIN COMPOSITION. Fee, $13.50.
PROFESSOR SANDERS. *28 assignments.*
Junior and senior elective.
The course will begin with translation into Latin of detached sentences illustrating the general principles of syntax and word order; the second half will deal with continuous narrative and with questions of diction and style.

c11. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
INTERMEDIATE LATIN. Fee, $8.00.
PROFESSOR SANDERS. *16 assignments.*
Freshman and sophomore elective.
The course consists of a review of Latin grammar and a study of Cicero's *De Amicitia.*

c26. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
LATIN POETRY. Fee, $13.50.
PROFESSOR SANDERS. *27 assignments.*
Sophomore elective.
Prerequisites, Latin 1-2-3 or 11-12-13, or the equivalent.
The course comprises the reading of the Phormio of Terence and selected odes of Horace. Emphasis is put on content of literary form.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

NOTE: Either Mathematics c1-c2-c3 or c7-c8 will meet the requirements of the freshman year.

c1. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
INTRODUCTORY MATHEMATICS. Fee, $8.00.
PROFESSOR GARNER. *18 assignments.*
This course treats the basic problems of college algebra. For a longer course in the subject, see Mathematics c7.

* Not available 1943-44.

c2. INTRODUCTORY MATHEMATICS.
PROFESSOR GARNER.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
18 assignments.

A study of functions and their graphs, the limit notion and graphical treatment of the fundamental notions of the differential and integral calculus.

c3. PLANE TRIGONOMETRY.
PROFESSOR LASLEY.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
18 assignments.

The fundamentals of plane trigonometry are studied with less extensive application than in Mathematics c8.

c7. COLLEGE ALGEBRA.
PROFESSOR GARNER.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
29 assignments.

This course treats the fundamental operations of algebra and emphasizes the solution of linear and quadratic equations. For a shorter course, see Mathematics c1.

c8. PLANE TRIGONOMETRY.
PROFESSOR LASLEY.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course concerns itself with the definitions of the trigonometric functions, their relations to each other, and the application of these functions and log tables to the solutions of plane triangles.

c13. SPHERICAL TRIGONOMETRY.
PROFESSOR GARNER.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
18 assignments.

This course is designed especially for those who are interested in nautical and aerial navigation. It concerns a study of the mathematics relations existing among the sides and the angles of a triangle on the surface of a sphere.

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

c1. ELEMENTARY THEORY OF MUSIC.
MISS SMITH.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

A study of the rudiments of music. Scales, intervals, and elementary harmonic material with practice in melody writing.

c14-c15-c16. HARMONY.
PROFESSOR SCHINHAN.
Prerequisite, Music c4, or the equivalent.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments, c14.
16 assignments, c15.
18 assignments, c16.

A first-year course in harmony. This covers the ordinary harmonic resources up to the chords of the seventh, their inversions, and elementary modulation.

c24-c25.
HISTORY OF MUSIC.
MISS SMITH.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

These courses correspond to the first two courses in residence in the series Music 24-25-26. Music c24 covers the period from antiquity to the end of the sixteenth century. Music c25 concerns the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Phonographic recordings of the music of the periods are used.

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

c26.
COMMUNISM, TOTALITARIANISM, AND DEMOCRACY.
PROFESSOR KUHN.

Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

The three types of contemporary political thought are studied with a view to clarifying the philosophical issues involved in the present struggle. The comparative analysis is to result in a better understanding of modern democracy and of its contribution to the post-war world.

c41.
INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY.
PROFESSOR KATTSOFF.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course will attempt to introduce students to basic problems in the various fields of philosophy. Its purpose will be to broaden students' views with respect to problems of contemporary civilization.

c86.
ETHICS.
PROFESSOR BROWNING.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A study of morals and of the theory of good conduct: problems connected with the search for a final moral standard and with so-called "ethical relativity"; acquaintance with the major types of moral theory, viewed in the perspective of their contribution to issues which confront man in the modern world.

c182.
SOCIAL ETHICS.
PROFESSOR WARREN.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This is a study of such key questions as: To what degree are human good and bad, right and wrong, social rather than simply personal matters? Are evils due in greatest part to social systems and circumstances or to private choices, untempered wishes, egoistic conduct? Can human ills be largely organized out of existence? Internationally? Nationally? Must personal morality, with or without a strong social consciousness, enter into any social order in a marked measure for this to function for the common good?

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

c51.
THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES
PROFESSOR ROBSON AND ASSISTANT.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A general course dealing with the national government of the United States. Attention will be directed to the constitutional basis, the

historical development, and the practical organization and operation of the institutions established for administering national affairs.

c52. THE GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. Fee, $13.50. *27 assignments.*
PROFESSOR HEXNER AND ASSISTANT.
A course in comparative government dealing with the governments of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Russia up to the beginning of World War II. Particular attention will be directed to the features in the structure, operation and trends in these governments which present contrasts to those in the United States.

c81. AMERICAN STATE GOVERNMENT. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. Fee, $13.50. *27 assignments.*
PROFESSOR JENKINS AND ASSISTANT.
A study in the principles, organization, and administrative methods of state government. In connection with the course will be a special study of the government of North Carolina.

Public Administration

cn1. THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE. Non-credit. Fee, $8.00. *16 assignments.*
PROFESSOR WAGER AND ASSISTANT.
This course is designed to assist persons engaged in public employment service and unemployment compensation work to increase their knowledge and to prepare persons for taking certain of the merit examinations given periodically by the Unemployment Compensation Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

*c21x-c22x-c23x. GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY. Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each. Fee, $8.00 each. *16 assignments each.*
MRS. ROGERS.
Junior and senior elective.
The aim of the course is to present the essential phenomena of psychology, and the various methods of approach. Emphasis is placed on the organic relationships within the whole field.

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES

NOTE: Candidates for degree credit at the University are required to take their courses in this department in residence.

FRENCH

c3. COMPOSITION AND READING—INTERMEDIATE. Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. Fee, $13.50. *27 assignments.*
PROFESSOR ENGSTROM.
It is understood that those who register for this course have had either

* Credit only for lecture part of course.

two years of high school French or one year of college French. The course consists of composition, grammar, and translation.

c4.
COMPOSITION AND READING—ADVANCED.
PROFESSOR ENGSTROM.
Prerequisites, French 1, 2, and 3 in residence, or one year of college French.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course consists of considerable reading of the masterpieces of modern French literature, with frequent compositions.

c21-c22.
FRENCH LITERATURE.
PROFESSOR ENGSTROM.
Prerequisites, French 3-4 or 11-12-13 or the equivalent.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.

French c21 is an introduction to the study of French literature, giving a general survey of French literature from its beginnings through the 17th century. A number of plays of Corneille, Racine, and Molière, will be read. French c22 is a survey of French literature through the 18th and 19th centuries. Selected reading from the works of Voltaire, Rousseau, Beaumarchais, Chateaubriand, and Victor Hugo will be required.

SPANISH

c3-c4.
SPANISH COMPOSITION.
MR. BURKS.
Prerequisites, either two years of high school or one year of college Spanish.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments each.

The object of these courses is to provide the student with an opportunity to acquire practice in writing Spanish.

c21-c22.
SPANISH LITERATURE.
MR. BURKS.
Prerequisites, Spanish 3-4 or 11-12-13 or the equivalent.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $13.50 each.
27 assignments, c21.
30 assignments, c22.

Spanish c21 is a general survey of Spanish literature during the 16th and 17th centuries. There is the reading of selections from Lope de Vega, Cervantes, Calderón, etc. Spanish c22 gives a general survey of Spanish literature since the classical period, with special stress on the 19th century.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

c51.
INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY.
PROFESSOR BROOKS.
Sophomore, junior, and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

A study is made of contemporary society, the forces underlying it, its organization and trends.

c52a-c52b.
SOCIAL PROBLEMS.
PROFESSOR MEYER AND ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

These courses concern a study of social problems such as leadership, race, population, family, immigration, crime and poverty.

c161a-c161b.
THE FAMILY.
PROFESSOR KLAISS AND ASSISTANT.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments each.

The first part deals with the historic significance of the family; its place and problems today under the influence of changing social and economic conditions; some criteria of family success; the family as a field for research. In c161b family relationships are examined in the light of psychological, sociological, legal, eugenic, educational, and economic influences with special emphasis on parent-child factors.

c173a-c173b.
PLAY AND RECREATION.
PROFESSOR MEYER.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
16 assignments each.

This course includes a history of the play movement and presents the theories of play with their application to community life.

c175.
EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES.
PROFESSOR MEYER.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs.
Fee, $8.00.
16 assignments.

In this course a study is made of the extra-curricular activities of pupils in the interest of arranging successful programs.

c181a-c181b.
REGIONAL SOCIOLOGY OF THE SOUTH.
PROFESSOR BROOKS.
Credit, 2 semester hrs. or 3 quarter hrs. each.
Fee, $8.00 each.
15 assignments each.
Prerequisite, Sociology 51.
A study is made of the South in terms of natural resources, human resources, and culture, with emphasis upon regional planning.

c182.
THE COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT.
PROFESSOR BROOKS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course concerns a study of cooperation with emphasis upon cooperative organization in the modern western world.

c185.
THE NEGRO.
DR. JOHNSON.
Junior and senior elective.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.
This course includes a study of the American Negro's historical and cultural background, aspects of Negro life and the problems of race relations.

RURAL SOCIAL ECONOMICS

c51.
RURAL ECONOMICS.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
25 assignments.

The purpose of this course is to acquaint the student with agriculture as a business, and to introduce him to the field of agricultural economy.

c53.
HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.
Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course is designed to acquaint the student with the stages of agricultural development from the earliest recorded times to the present.

c71. RURAL SOCIOLOGY.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course makes a study of the rural community, considering the advantages and disadvantages of farm life, rural health, sanitation and social institutions.

c101. NORTH CAROLINA: ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL.
PROFESSOR HOBBS.

Credit, 3 1/3 semester hrs. or 5 quarter hrs.
Fee, $13.50.
27 assignments.

This course is designed to furnish an economic and social interpretation of North Carolina.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES OFFERED BY COLLEGE EXTENSION DIVISION NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, RALEIGH, N. C.

Agriculture

Course	*Credit*
A. H. 202, Animal Nutrition I	3 term hours
A. H. 361, Animal Nutrition II	3 term hours
A. H. 313, Sheep Production	3 term hours
Hort. 303, Vegetable Gardening	3 term hours
Hort. 313, Home Floriculture	3 term hours
Poul. 201, General Poultry	3 term hours
Poul. 333, Poultry Nutrition	3 term hours
Poul. 401, Poultry Diseases	3 term hours

Agricultural Economics—Rural Sociology

Agr. Econ. 303, Farm Management	3 term hours
Rur. Soc. 302, Rural Sociology	3 term hours

Art

A. E. 205a, History of Architecture	2 term hours
A. E. 205b, History of Architecture	2 term hours
A. E. 205c, History of Architecture	2 term hours

Education

Ed. 303, Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Ed. 304, Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Ed. 471, Psychology of the Exceptional Pupil	3 term hours
Ed. 476, Psychology of Adolescence	3 term hours
Ed. 420, Philosophy of Guidance	3 term hours
Ed. 440, Vocational Education	3 term hours
Ed. 424, Occupational Studies	3 term hours
Ed. 452, Industrial Arts	3 term hours

Economics

Econ. 201, General Economics	3 term hours
Econ. 202, General Economics	3 term hours
Econ. 307, Business Law	3 term hours

English

Eng. 211, Business English	3 term hours
Eng. 265, American Literature I	3 term hours
Eng. 266, American Literature II	3 term hours

Geology

Geol. 120a, Physical Geology	3 term hours
Geol. Ex. 207A, Physical Geography	3 term hours
Geol. Ex. 207B, Physical Geography	3 term hours

History

Course	*Credit*
Hist. Ex. 101, American Economic History to 1789	3 term hours
Hist. Ex. 102, American Economic History, 1789-1865	3 term hours
Hist. Ex. 103, American Economic History Since 1865	3 term hours
Hist. 200, The Colonial Period of American History	3 term hours
Hist. 201, History of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War	3 term hours
Hist. 202, American National Development, 1860-1920	3 term hours
Hist. 204, Modern European History, 1500-1815	3 term hours
Hist. 205, Modern European History, 1815-1870	3 term hours
Hist. 206, Contemporary Europe	3 term hours
Hist. 207, Modern European History, 1815-1940	3 term hours
Hist. 303, History of North Carolina	3 term hours
Hist. 307, Economic and Social History of the South	3 term hours
Hist. 308, Economic and Social History of the South	3 term hours
Hist. 309, Economic and Social History of the South	3 term hours
Hist. 310, American Biography	3 term hours
Hist. 321, The Hispanic American Republics	3 term hours

Political Science

Pol. Sc. 200, American National Government	3 term hours
Pol. Sc. 201, State Government and Administration	3 term hours
Pol. Sc. 202, Municipal Government and Administration	3 term hours
Pol. Sc. 203, American Political Parties	3 term hours

Engineering

Cer. E. 102, Ceramic Materials	3 term hours
Cer. E. 103, Ceramic and Mining Processes	3 term hours
Cer. E. 201, Drying Fundamentals and Practice	3 term hours
Cer. E. 252, Firing Fundamentals and Practice	3 term hours
Cer. E. 252b, Setting Heavy Clay Products	Non-credit
Cer. E. 301, Bodies, Glazes and Colors	3 term hours
Cer. E. 302, Metal Enamels	3 term hours
Cer. E. 305, Pyrometry	1 term hour
M. E. 105, Engineering Drawing	3 term hours
M. E. 106, Engineering Drawing	3 term hours
H. E. Ex. 101, Accidents and Their Prevention	3 term hours

Mathematics

Math. 102, Plane and Spherical Trigonometry	6 term hours
Math. 103, Analytical Geometry	6 term hours
Math. 201, Calculus I	4 term hours
Math. 202, Calculus II	4 term hours
Math. 303, Calculus III	4 term hours

Modern Languages

M. L. 101, Elementary French	3 term hours
M. L. 102, Elementary French	3 term hours
M. L. 201, Elementary French Prose	3 term hours
M. L. 105, Elementary Spanish	3 term hours
M. L. 106, Elementary Spanish	3 term hours

Course	*Credit*
M. L. 205, Elementary Spanish Prose	3 term hours
M. L. 103, Elementary German	3 term hours
M. L. 104, Elementary German	3 term hours
M. L. 209a, Spanish Prose	3 term hours
M. L. 209b, Spanish Prose	3 term hours
M. L. 209c, Spanish Prose	3 term hours

Psychology

Psy. 200, Introduction to Psychology	3 term hours
Psy. 202, Psychology of Personality and Adjustment	3 term hours
Psy. 303, Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Psy. 304, Educational Psychology	3 term hours
Psy. 471, Psychology of the Exceptional Pupil	3 term hours
Psy. 476, Psychology of Adolescence	3 term hours

Sociology

Soc. 101, Human Relations	2 term hours
Soc. 102, Human Relations	2 term hours
Soc. 103, Human Relations	2 term hours
Soc. 202, General Sociology	3 term hours
Soc. 203, General Sociology	3 term hours
Soc. 400, Criminology	3 term hours
Soc. 401, Social Pathology	3 term hours
Soc. Ex. 402, Sociology of City Life	3 term hours
Soc. 406, The American Family	3 term hours

Zoology

Zool. Ex. 108, Heredity and Eugenics	3 term hours

For further information, write to the College Extension Division, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICES

In addition to the correspondence courses listed in this catalogue, the University of North Carolina offers, through the Extension Division, the following services to the people of the state:

Art. The North Carolina School Art Exhibition is conducted annually in cooperation with the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina and the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs. Circulating art exhibits may be secured on a loan basis.

Audio-Visual Aids. Sound and silent educational films, lantern slides, recordings and other teaching aids are loaned to schools, colleges, and community organizations. A special catalogue of this service may be obtained upon request. The Bureau of Visual Instruction is a distributing agency for government war films.

Dramatic Art. Assistance is given in organization for dramatic activities, in play selection and production, and in the loan of playbooks and other

library material. An annual tournament is conducted in cooperation with the Carolina Dramatic Association.

Engineering, Science, and Management War Training. In cooperation with the United States Office of Education, the Division administers tuition-free, non-credit courses in Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, and Production Supervision.

Extension Class Instruction. Late afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes are organized wherever enough enrollments to cover expenses are secured. Courses of both a vocational and cultural nature are offered, with college credit, if desired.

Interscholastic Activities. In cooperation with several University departments and state agencies, the Division conducts annual contests in debating, athletics, and academic subjects.

Lectures. Popular and technical lectures and readings by members of the faculty are arranged for schools, clubs, and other community organizations. Lecture courses either on a particular subject or a series of topics may be obtained.

Library Service. Reading courses, books, and reference materials are loaned to individuals and groups interested in the systematic study and discussion of literary, historical, social, and other subjects. There are available about one hundred outlines for study suitable for women's clubs or other groups.

Postgraduate Medical Courses. Each year a series of clinics and lectures is conducted for practicing physicians at two or more centers.

Public Forums. In cooperation with the State Department of Public Instruction, the Extension Division conducts a public forum program, the purpose of which is to stimulate study and discussion of public affairs as a means of extending civic knowledge and strengthening democracy.

Radio. The University Radio Studio produces several series of educational and entertainment programs that are broadcast weekly through the facilities of ten or more commercial radio stations.

Short Courses and Institutes. Short Courses and Institutes are held at the University for groups interested in intensive training and instructional programs.

Summer Courses for High School Students. The Extension Division in cooperation with the Department of Music conducts the annual "All State High School Music Course" at Chapel Hill during the first term of the University Summer Session. The Annual Summer Session in Dramatic Art for high school students is sponsored jointly by the Division and the Department of Dramatic Art.

The University News Letter, containing the results of studies made of economic and social conditions in North Carolina, is sent free to residents of the state.

For information about any of the above services, write to the UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION, Chapel Hill, N. C.

REGISTRATION BLANK FOR CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

University Extension Division

Chapel Hill, N. C.

This blank is to be filled out completely in applicant's own handwriting. It must be accompanied by check or money order to cover fee. For course fees for non-residents of North Carolina and registration fee for all, see pages 8-9.

In sending this application, I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the Extension Division as set down on pages 7 to 35 of the catalog:

1. Name (in full) ..... Age .....
   (Mr., Miss, or Mrs) Race .....

2. Present address .....
   (City) (County) (State)

3. Permanent address .....

4. Previous education .....

5. If you have ever registered in any division of this University before, underline which division and give date: Residence term ..... Summer school ..... Extension class ..... Correspondence .....

6. Number and subject of course desired .....

7. Kind of credit desired (mark X): Undergraduate degree credit .....

   Toward what degree? ..... At what institution? .....

   If credit is desired elsewhere, have you secured the approval of the authorities?

   ..... Certification credit ..... Professional credit.

   ..... No credit ..... Occupation .....

8. If teaching, give KIND of certificate held ..... Class ..... No. .....

9. Do you wish to purchase the books through the Extension Division? .....

REGISTRATION BLANK FOR CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

University Extension Division

Chapel Hill, N. C.

This blank is to be filled out completely in applicant's own handwriting. It must be accompanied by check or money order to cover fee. For course fees for non-residents of North Carolina and registration fee for all, see pages 8-9.

In sending this application, I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the Extension Division as set down on pages 7 to 35 of the catalog:

1. Name (in full) ..... Age .....
   (Mr., Miss, or Mrs.) Race .....

2. Present address .....
   (City) (County) (State)

3. Permanent address .....

4. Previous education .....

5. If you have ever registered in any division of this University before, underline which division and give date: Residence term ..... Summer school ..... Extension class ..... Correspondence .....

6. Number and subject of course desired .....

7. Kind of credit desired (mark X): Undergraduate degree credit .....

   Toward what degree? ..... At what institution? .....

   If credit is desired elsewhere, have you secured the approval of the authorities? ..... Certification credit ..... Professional credit. ..... No credit ..... Occupation .....

8. If teaching, give KIND of certificate held ..... Class ..... No. .....

9. Do you wish to purchase the books through the Extension Division? .....

REGISTRATION BLANK FOR CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

University Extension Division

Chapel Hill, N. C.

This blank is to be filled out completely in applicant's own handwriting. It must be accompanied by check or money order to cover fee. For course fees for non-residents of North Carolina and registration fee for all, see pages 8-9.

In sending this application, I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the Extension Division as set down on pages 7 to 35 of the catalog:

1. Name (in full) ..... Age .....
   (Mr., Miss, or Mrs) Race .....

2. Present address .....
   (City) (County) (State)

3. Permanent address .....

4. Previous education .....

5. If you have ever registered in any division of this University before, underline which division and give date: Residence term..... Summer school ..... Extension class..... Correspondence.....

6. Number and subject of course desired.....

7. Kind of credit desired (mark X): Undergraduate degree credit.....

   Toward what degree?..... At what institution?.....

   If credit is desired elsewhere, have you secured the approval of the authorities?

   ..... Certification credit..... Professional credit.

   ..... No credit..... Occupation.....

8. If teaching, give KIND of certificate held..... Class..... No.....

9. Do you wish to purchase the books through the Extension Division?.....

STUDY OUTLINES
LIBRARY EXTENSION PUBLICATIONS

VOLUME VI

1. October, 1939. *The New Frontier.* W. W. Drake.
2. January, 1940. *United States Mural; a Study of Regional Novels.* Lucile Kelling.
*3. April, 1940. *Other People's Lives, Seventh Series.* C. S. Love.
4. May, 1940. *Adventures in Reading, Thirteenth Series.* A. B. Adams.
5. June, 1940. *Adventures with Opera.* A. D. McCall.
6. July, 1940. *Arts and Crafts in Georgian England.* M. N. Bond.

VOLUME VII

1. October, 1940. *The United States in the World Crisis.* E. S. & J. L. Godfrey.
2. January, 1941. *The Old North State.* A. B. Adams.
3. April, 1941. *The Film Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow.* Walter Spearman.
4. May, 1941. *Religion and Contemporary Life.* Dale Spearman.
5. June, 1941. *"Eyes South."* E. S. Godfrey and J. L. Godfrey.
6. July, 1941. *Adventures in Reading, Fourteenth Series.* A. B. Adams.

VOLUME VIII

1. October, 1941. *The Modern Woman's Unfinished Business.* E. C. Baity.
2. January, 1942. *Understanding the News.* Walter Spearman.
3. April, 1942. *Adventures in Reading, Fifteenth Series.* A. B. Adams.
4. May, 1942. *Other People's Lives, Eighth Series.* C. S. Love.
5. June, 1942. *Places and Peoples of the Pacific.* D. & W. Spearman.
6. July, 1942. *Blueprints for Tomorrow.* A. B. Adams.

VOLUME IX

1. October, 1942. *Some Leaders of the World at War.* E. S. & J. L. Godfrey.
2. January, 1943. *Adventures in Reading, Sixteenth Series.* D. & W. Spearman.
3. April, 1943. *The Home Maker and Lists.* Mrs. N. B. Adams.
4. May, 1943. *The Conflict of Political Ideas.* L. O. Kattsoff.

Single copies, 50 cents each; in North Carolina, 25 cents.

Advance subscription per volume, $2.00; to residents of North Carolina, $1.00. Copies sent on approval. A complete list of titles will be sent upon request.

---

* Out of print. Available only as loan.

THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LIBRARY
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.